arXiv:1601.01082v2 [math.ST] 17 Nov 2016

MODEL COMPARISON FOR DEPENDENT GENERALIZED LINEAR MODEL

SHOICHI EGUCHI

Abstract. The classical Bayesian information criterion (BIC) is derived through the stochastic expansion of marginal likelihood function under suitable regularity condition when models are correctly specified. However, despite of its popularity, mathematical validity of BIC for possibly misspecified models with complicated dependence structure is often ignored. Thus it is important to extend the reach of the classical BIC with rigorous theoretical foundation with allowing model misspecification and asymptotic normality of estimator. In this paper, we will prove the stochastic expansion of marginal quasi-likelihood function associated with a class of possibly misspecified generalized linear models for dependent data.

1. Introduction

Generalized linear model (GLM, McCullagh and Nelder [25]) is an extension of a linear regression model. This model depends on canonical parameter and dispersion parameter, where the former is represented by the link function determined by the conditional distribution of the response variable given the explanatory variable. Moreover, GLM has many applications and extensions; for example, actuarial science (Antonio and Beirlant [3], Haberman and Renshaw [17]), GLMixedM in risk management (McNeil and Wendin [26]) and generalized additive models (Berg [5], Hastie and Tibshirani [18]).

We consider data $(y_j, x_j)_{j=1}^n = (y_j, x_{j,1}, \ldots, x_{j,p})_{j=1}^n$, where y_j's and x_j's are realizations of the response variables $\mathbf{Y}_n = (Y_1, \ldots, Y_n)'$ and the explanatory variables $\mathbf{X}_n = (X_1, \ldots, X_n)'$, respectively, where the notation $'$ means the transpose. Furthermore, we will assume that the conditional distribution of $\mathbf{Y}_n$ given $\mathbf{X}_n$ is given by a GLM. Then the conditional distribution is assumed to belong to an exponential family, for example normal, binomial, Poisson and so on. In this paper, we will give a result about the stochastic expansion the stochastic expansion of marginal quasi-likelihood function associated with a class of possibly misspecified GLMs for dependent data. Based on the expansion, we propose the quasi-Bayesian information criterion, which is an extension of the generalized BIC given by Luv and Liu [23].

Suppose that we are given M Bayesian candidate models $\mathfrak{M}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{M}_M$. Each $\mathfrak{M}_m$ is described by $\big\{\big(\mathfrak{p}_m, \pi_m(\theta), \mathbb{H}_{m,n}(\theta)\big)\big|\theta \in \Theta_m\big\}$, where $\mathfrak{p}_m$ is the non-zero prior relative occurrence probability of mth-model among the M Bayesian models, π_m is the prior-probability density on Θ_m and $\mathbb{H}_{m,n}$ is the logarithmic quasi-likelihood function. Here "quasi" means that we consider the parametric model that may not include the true distribution of observation data. The conventional Bayesian principle of model selection for $\mathfrak{M}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{M}_M$ is to choose the model that is most likely in terms of the posterior probability, i.e. to choose model $\mathfrak{M}_{m_0}$ such that $m_0 = \mathrm{argmax}_{m\in\{1,\ldots,M\}}\ P(\mathfrak{M}_m|\mathbf{y}_n)$, where

$$P(\mathfrak{M}_m|\mathbf{y}_n) = \frac{\Big(\int_{\Theta_m} \exp\{\mathbb{H}_{m,n}(\theta)\}\pi_m(\theta)d\theta\Big)\mathfrak{p}_m}{\sum_{i=1}^M \Big(\int_{\Theta_i} \exp\{\mathbb{H}_{i,n}(\theta)\}\pi_i(\theta)d\theta\Big)\mathfrak{p}_i},$$

where $\int_{\Theta_m} \exp\{\mathbb{H}_{m,n}(\theta)\}\pi_m(\theta)d\theta$ is called the marginal quasi-likelihood function. When the prior plausibilities on the M competing models would be equal, we select the model that maximizes the marginal quasi-likelihood function; even if the prior probabilities are not equal, we can trivially correct the selection manner by the factors $\mathfrak{p}_m$. Hence we focus on the logarithm of the marginal quasi-likelihood function

$$\log\Big(\int_{\Theta} \exp\{\mathbb{H}_{m,n}(\theta)\}\pi_m(\theta)d\theta\Big)$$

Date: November 18, 2016.

Key words and phrases. Asymptotic Bayesian model comparison, quasi-likelihood, dependent data, model misspecification, generalized linear model.

to make model selection.

As was explained in [23], another interpretation of model selection is possible through the Kullback-Leibler divergence (KL divergence). The KL divergence between the true conditionnal model g_n and the marginal quasi-likelihood function $\int_\Theta \exp\{\mathbb{H}_{m,n}(\theta)\}\pi_m(\theta)d\theta$ is given by

$$I\left(g_n; \int_\Theta \exp\{\mathbb{H}_{m,n}(\theta)\}\pi_m(\theta)d\theta)\right) = E[\log g_n(\mathbf{Y}_n|\mathbf{X}_n)] + E\left[-\int_\Theta \exp\{\mathbb{H}_{m,n}(\theta)\}\pi_m(\theta)d\theta\right], \quad (1)$$

where the expectation is taken with respect to the true distribution G_n. Because of (1), we see that $-\int_\Theta \exp\{\mathbb{H}_{m,n}(\theta)\}\pi_m(\theta)d\theta$ is an unbiased estimator of $I\big(g_n; \int_\Theta \exp\{\mathbb{H}_n(\theta;\cdot)\}\pi(\theta)d\theta\big)$ except for a constant term free of θ. Note that (1) holds true regardless of whether or not the true model is in the set of candidate models, implying that Bayesian principle of model selection can be restated as choosing the model that minimizes the KL divergence of the marginal quasi-likelihood function from the true distribution.

In particular, assume that $\mathbf{X}_n$ is absent and that $\mathbb{H}_{m,n}(\theta) = \sum_{j=1}^n \log f_{m,n}(y_j;\theta)$ for the case of independent observations $y_1,\ldots,y_n$ with correctly specified regular models, then Schwarz [27] showed that the marginal quasi-likelihood, $\log(\int_\Theta \exp\{\mathbb{H}_{m,n}(\theta)\}\pi_m(\theta)d\theta)$ admits the stochastic expansion

$$\log\left(\int_\Theta \exp\{\mathbb{H}_{m,n}(\theta)\}\pi_m(\theta)d\theta\right) = \sum_{j=1}^n \log f_{m,n}(y_j;\hat\theta^{\mathrm{MLE}}_{m,n}) - \frac{p}{2}\log n + O_p(1), \quad (2)$$

with $\hat\theta^{\mathrm{MLE}}_{m,n}$ denoting the maximum likelihood estimator of θ, under some regularity conditions. Due to (2), we obtain the classical Bayesian information criterion for model selection:

$$\mathrm{BIC} = -2\sum_{j=1}^n \log f_{m,n}(y_j;\hat\theta^{\mathrm{MLE}}_{m,n}) + p\log n.$$

In the past, many authors have investigated the information criteria for model selection in various settings; see, for example, Burnham and Anderson [7] for an account of these developments. Bozdogan [6] showed that Akaike information criterion (AIC, Akaike [1], [2]) has a positive probability of overestimating the true dimension. Casella *et al.* [8] and Fasen and Kimmig [16] as well as the references therein studied the model selection consistency of BIC. Moreover, various extensions of AIC and BIC have been introduced; for example, the extended BIC for large model spaces (Chen and Chen [10]), the generalized information criteria (Konishi and Kitagawa [21]), the generalized BIC in misspecified GLMs for independent data (Lv and Liu [23]) and the information criteria in the case of dependent data (e.g. Sei and Komaki [28] and Uchida [29]).

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we describe our working model, notations and assumptions. We also discuss the asymptotic properties of the quasi-maximum likelihood estimator in possibly misspecified GLM for dependent data. Section 3 presents the stochastic expansion of the logarithmic marginal quasi-likelihood and the consistency of the model selection with respect to the optimal model. In Section 4, we illustrate the performance of model selection criterion in correctly specified and misspecified models. Section 5 presents a real data example. The proofs of our results are given in Section 6.

2. Quasi-maximum likelihood estimation of dependent GLM

Let $\mathbf{Y}_n = (Y_1,\ldots,Y_n)'$ be the n-dimensional random vector and $\mathbf{X}_n = (X_1,\ldots,X_n)'$ be the $n\times p$ random time series. We write $X_j = (X_{j,1},\ldots,X_{j,p})'$ for any j. We assume that the unknown true distribution of $(\mathbf{X}_n,\mathbf{Y}_n)$ has the density g_n with respect to some dominating σ-finite measure:

$$g_n(\mathbf{x}_n,\mathbf{y}_n) = g_n(\mathbf{x}_n)g_n(\mathbf{y}_n|\mathbf{x}_n),$$

where $\mathbf{x}_n = (x_1,\ldots,x_n)'$, $x_j = (x_{j,1},\ldots,x_{j,p})'$ and $\mathbf{y}_n = (y_1,\ldots,y_n)'$.

2.1. **Model setup.** We consider possibly misspecified M candidate models to estimate the true model G_n. Each candidate model is given by

$$f_{m,n}(\mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{y}_n; \theta) = f_n(\mathbf{x}_n) f_{m,n}(\mathbf{y}_n|\mathbf{x}_n; \theta) = f_n(\mathbf{x}_n) \prod_{j=1}^{n} f_{m,n,j}(y_j|x_j; \theta) \tag{3}$$

with $\theta = (\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_{p_m}) \in \Theta_m$, where the mth parameter space $\Theta_m \subset \mathbb{R}^{p_m}$ is a bounded convex domain and $p_m \le p$. Although the true structure is unknown, (3) means that the candidate models are given as if $Y_1, \ldots, Y_n$ are $(X_1, \ldots, X_n)$-conditionally independent and each $(X_1, \ldots, X_n)$-conditional distribution of Y_j depends on only X_j. In applications of GLM, the setting that Y_j's are independent or conditionally independent is often assumed. The later condition is used to simplify theoretical consideration and is not essential. Furthermore, since X_j is a multidimensional variable, Y_j can be given by various expressions. (3) also means that we do not focus on the distribution of $\mathbf{X}_n$, and the similar situation may be considered in applications. Therefore, we consider only the true conditional distribution of $\mathbf{Y}_n$ given $\mathbf{X}_n$ and use GLM $\mathfrak{M}_m$ as our working model, with respect to some dominating measure: $\mathfrak{M}_m$ is given by

$$f_{m,n}(\mathbf{y}_n|\mathbf{x}_n; \theta) = \prod_{j=1}^{n} f_{m,n,j}(y_j|x_j; \theta) = \prod_{j=1}^{n} \exp\big(y_j x_j'\theta - b_m(x_j'\theta) + c_m(y_j)\big), \tag{4}$$

where, for brevity, we write $x_j'\theta = \sum_{i=1}^{p_m} x_{j,d_i(m)}\theta_i$ with $\{d_1(m), \ldots, d_{p_m}(m)\} \subset \{1, \ldots, p\}$ for any m, $b_m(\cdot)$ and $c_m(\cdot)$ are determined by each assumed conditional distribution of $\mathbf{Y}_n$ given $\mathbf{X}_n$ and $b_m(\cdot)$ is a sufficiently smooth convex function defined on $\mathbb{R}$; for example, $b_m(\theta) = \theta^2/2$ (Gaussian regression) and $b_m(\theta) = \log(1 + e^\theta)$ (Logistic regression). For simplicity, we assume that $b_1(\theta) = \cdots = b_M(\theta)$ and $c_1(y) = \cdots = c_M(y)$, that is, only consider variable selection concerning $\mathbf{X}_n$. As is well known, for any n-dimensional random vector $\mathbf{Z}_n$ whose conditional distribution given X_n is (4), we have $E_\theta[Z_j|X_j] = \partial b_m(X_j'\theta)$ and $V_\theta[Z_j|X_j] = \partial^2 b_m(X_j'\theta)$, where $\partial b_m(x) = \frac{\partial}{\partial\theta} b_m(\theta)\big|_{\theta=x}$.

Since any candidate model $\mathfrak{M}_m$ is possibly misspecified and $c_m(\cdot)$ of (4) is independent of θ, we may and do define the logarithmic marginal quasi-likelihood function $\mathbb{H}_{m,n}$ by

$$\mathbb{H}_{m,n}(\theta) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \big(Y_j X_j'\theta - b_m(X_j'\theta)\big). \tag{5}$$

Any random mapping $\hat\theta_{m,n}$ such that

$$\hat\theta_{m,n} \in \operatorname*{argmax}_{\theta\in\Theta_m} \mathbb{H}_{m,n}(\theta)$$

is called the quasi-maximum likelihood estimator (QMLE) associated with $\mathbb{H}_{m,n}$. Clearly, when b is differentiable, $\hat\theta_{m,n}$ is the solution to the quasi-score function

$$\partial_\theta \mathbb{H}_{m,n}(\theta) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \big(Y_j - \partial b_m(X_j'\theta)\big) X_j = 0,$$

where $\partial_\theta = \partial/\partial\theta$.

For notational brevity, from now on we will omit the model index "m" from the notation.

2.2. **Asymptotic behavior of the QMLE.** In this section, we will show that the asymptotic properties of the QMLE in misspecified GLMs with the dependent observations. Fahrmeir and Kaufmann [15] studied the consistency and asymptotic normality of the MLE in correctly specified GLMs. Moreover, White [31] and Domowitz and White [12] investigated the properties of the QMLE in misspecified models and treated independent data and dependent data, respectively. The settings of Domowitz and White [12] are more general than our settings, but we will assume clearer conditions more tailored for the GLMs. In this paper, we will focus on not only the QMLE but also the model selection.

Let $\mathcal{F}_j = \sigma(Y_i, X_i; i \le j)$ denote the σ-field representing the data information at stage j. If a_n and b_n satisfy $a_n \le C b_n$ for some constant $C > 0$, we write $a_n \lesssim b_n$. We introduce the following conditions:

Assumption 2.1. *For some constant $C \ge 0$ and $C' \ge 0$, (i) $\max_{i\in\{1,2,3\}} |\partial^i b(x)| \lesssim 1 + |x|^C$,*

(ii) $E\big[|Y_j|^3|\mathcal{F}_{j-1} \vee \sigma(X_j)\big] \lesssim 1 + |X_j|^{C'}$ a.s. for any $j \in \mathbb{N}$,

(iii) $\sup_{j\in\mathbb{N}} E\big[|X_j|^{3C+C'+3}\big] < \infty$.

Assumption 2.2. *There exists a measurable function $F : \mathbb{R}^p \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $E[Y_j|\mathcal{F}_{j-1}\vee\sigma(X_j)] = F(X_j)$ for every $j \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Assumption 2.3. *Denote $\zeta_j = (X_j, Y_j)$ for any j. For some $c > 0$,*

$$\alpha(k) \le c^{-1}e^{-ck}$$

for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, where

$$\alpha(k) := \sup_{j\in\mathbb{N}} \sup_{\substack{A\in\sigma(\zeta_i;i\le j)\\ B\in\sigma(\zeta_i;i\ge j+k)}} |P[A\cap B] - P[A]P[B]|.$$

When Assumption 2.3 holds, $\{\zeta_j; j = 1, 2, \ldots\}$ is called exponential α-mixing. In particular, Assumption 2.3 implies that $\psi_j := \big(Y_j - F(X_j)\big)X_j$, $j \in \mathbb{N}$, is exponential α-mixing.

Assumption 2.4. *There exists a non-degenerate probability measure ν such that the following holds:*

(i) $\dfrac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n \big(F(X_j)X_j'\theta - b(X_j'\theta)\big) - \displaystyle\int \big(F(x)x'\theta - b(x'\theta)\big)\nu(dx) \xrightarrow{P} 0$ *for any $\theta \in \Theta$,*

(ii) $\dfrac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n \partial^2 b(X_j'\theta)X_jX_j' - \displaystyle\int \partial^2 b(x'\theta)xx'\nu(dx) \xrightarrow{P} 0$ *for any $\theta \in \Theta$,*

where the notation $\xrightarrow{P}$ means the convergence in probability.

Assumption 2.5. *There exists a function $\underline{b} : \mathbb{R}^p \to (0, \infty)$, (i) for any x, $\inf_{\theta\in\Theta} \partial^2 b(x'\theta) \ge \underline{b}(x)$,*

(ii) for some constant $\lambda_0 > 0$, $\limsup_{n\to\infty} P\left[\lambda_{\min}\left(\dfrac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n \underline{b}(X_j)X_jX_j'\right) < \lambda_0\right] = 0$, where $\lambda_{\min}(\cdot)$ denotes the smallest eigenvalues of a given matrix.

Assumptions 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3 are for establishing the asymptotic properties such as Lemmas 6.1 and 6.2. Moreover these assumptions facilitate the derivation of the consistency and the asymptotic normality of the QMLE $\hat{\theta}_n$, which are given in Theorems 2.8 and 2.10, respectively.

If Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2 hold, for some constant $C \ge 0$ and $C' \ge 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{n>0} E\left[\sup_{\theta\in\Theta}\left|\partial_\theta\left\{\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n \big(F(X_j)X_j'\theta - \partial b(X_j'\theta)\big)\right\}\right|\right] &\le \sup_{n>0}\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n E\left[\Big(\big|F(X_j)\big| + \sup_{\theta\in\Theta}\big|\partial b(X_j'\theta)\big|\Big)|X_j|\right]\\ &\lesssim \sup_{n>0}\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n E\left[\Big((1+|X_j|)^{C'} + (1+|X_j|)^{C}\Big)|X_j|\right]\\ &< \infty. \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

Since (6) gives the tightness of $\big\{\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n \big(F(X_j)X_j'\theta - \partial b(X_j'\theta)\big)\big\}$, we have

$$\sup_{\theta\in\Theta}\left|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n \big(F(X_j)X_j'\theta - b(X_j'\theta)\big) - \int \big(F(x)x'\theta - b(x'\theta)\big)\nu(dx)\right| \xrightarrow{P} 0 \tag{7}$$

under Assumptions 2.1, 2.2 and 2.4 (i). By using (7), we can prove Theorem 2.8 easily.

From Assumptions 2.1-2.3 and 2.4 (i), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{n}\mathbb{H}_n(\theta) &= \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n \psi_j'\theta + \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n \big\{\big(F(X_j)X_j'\theta - b(X_j'\theta)\big)\big\}\\ &= O_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right) + \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n \big\{\big(F(X_j)X_j'\theta - b(X_j'\theta)\big)\big\} \xrightarrow{P} \int \big(F(x)x'\theta - b(x'\theta)\big)\nu(dx) =: \mathbb{H}_0(\theta). \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

The proof of the tightness of $\big\{\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{j=1}^n \psi_j\big\}$ is given in Lemma 6.1.

Assumption 2.5 ensures the uniqueness of the QMLE $\hat{\theta}_n$ by the strict concavity of $\mathbb{H}_n$. Since Assumption 2.4 (ii) gives $-\frac{1}{n}\partial_\theta^2 \mathbb{H}_n(\theta) = -\partial_\theta^2 \mathbb{H}_0(\theta) + o_p(1)$ for any θ, Assumptions 2.1-2.5 imply that the equation

$$\partial_\theta \mathbb{H}_0(\theta) = \int \big(F(x) - \partial b(x'\theta)\big) x \nu(dx) = 0$$

admits a unique solution. Then we may define the *optimal* parameter θ_0 as the unique maximizer of $\mathbb{H}_0(\theta)$:

$$\{\theta_0\} = \operatorname*{argmax}_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathbb{H}_0(\theta)$$

The quasi-observed information is given by $\Gamma_n := -\frac{1}{n}\partial_\theta^2 \mathbb{H}_n(\theta_0) = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n \partial^2 b(X_j'\theta_0) X_j X_j'$, so that Γ_n satisfies the equation

$$\Gamma_n = \Gamma_0 + o_p(1),$$

where $\Gamma_0 := \int \partial^2 b(x'\theta_0) x x' \nu(dx)$.

Remark 2.6. The β-mixing coefficients of $\{\zeta_j\}$ are defined by

$$\beta(k) := \sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} E\bigg[\sup_{B \in \sigma(\zeta_i; i \geq j+k)} \big| P\big(B | \sigma(\zeta_i; i \leq j)\big) - P(B) \big| \bigg].$$

If $\beta(k) = O(e^{-ak})$ for some $a > 0$ and for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, then $\{\zeta_j\}$ is called exponential β-mixing (e.g. Davydov [11] and Liebscher [22]). The exponential β-mixing property implies the exponential α-mixing property. When we replace Assumption 2.3 by the condition that $\{\zeta_j\}$ is exponential β-mixing under some appropriate moment condition, the following conditions follow on applying an obvious discrete-time counterpart of Masuda [24, Lemma 4.3]: (i) For some constant $\beta_1 > 0$ and $q_1 > 0$,

$$\sup_{n>0} E\bigg[\bigg(n^{\beta_1} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \bigg| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \big(F(X_j) X_j'\theta - b(X_j'\theta)\big) - \int \big(F(x)x'\theta - b(x'\theta)\big)\nu(dx) \bigg| \bigg)^{q_1} \bigg] < \infty.$$

(ii) For some constant $\beta_2 > 0$ and $q_2 > 0$,

$$\sup_{n>0} E\bigg[\bigg(n^{\beta_2} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \bigg| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \partial^2 b(X_j'\theta) X_j X_j' - \int \partial^2 b(x'\theta) x x' \nu(dx) \bigg| \bigg)^{q_2} \bigg] < \infty.$$

Because of Borel-Canntelli lemma, if q_1 and q_2 can be taken large enough, we may deduce almost surely

$$\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \bigg| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \big(F(X_j) X_j'\theta - b(X_j'\theta)\big) - \int \big(F(x)x'\theta - b(x'\theta)\big)\nu(dx) \bigg| \to 0$$

and

$$\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \bigg| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \partial^2 b(X_j'\theta) X_j X_j' - \int \partial^2 b(x'\theta) x x' \nu(dx) \bigg| \to 0.$$

□

Remark 2.7. We can relax Assumption 2.2 by replacing $E[Y_j | \mathcal{F}_{j-1} \vee \sigma(X_j)] = F(X_j)$ with $E[Y_j | \mathcal{F}_{j-1} \vee \sigma(X_j)] = F(X_{j-m+1}, \ldots, X_j)$ for some $m \geq 1$. When we assume relaxed condition, Assumption 2.4 (i) is modified. For example, in the case of $m = 2$, Assumption 2.4 (i) is given by

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=2}^n \big(F(X_{j-1}, X_j) X_j'\theta - b(X_j'\theta)\big) - \int \big(F(x_1, x_2)x_2'\theta - b(x_2'\theta)\big) P(x_1, dx_2)\nu(dx_1) \xrightarrow{P} 0,$$

where P is a transition function. □

Theorem 2.8. *Under Assumptions 2.1-2.5, the QMLE satisfies*

$$\hat{\theta}_n \xrightarrow{P} \theta_0$$

as $n \to \infty$.

Assumption 2.9. *(i)* $\{X_j; j = 1, 2, \ldots\}$ *is strictly stationary.*

(ii) For some $\Sigma_0 > 0$, $\frac{1}{n}E\Big[\Big\{\sum_{j=1}^{n}\big(Y_j - \partial b(X_j'\theta_0)\big)X_j\Big\}\Big\{\sum_{j=1}^{n}\big(Y_j - \partial b(X_j'\theta_0)\big)X_j\Big\}'\Big] \to \Sigma_0$.

Theorem 2.10. *Under Assumptions 2.1-2.5 and 2.9, the asymptotic distribution of the QMLE is normal:*

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_0) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} N(0, \Gamma_0^{-1}\Sigma_0\Gamma_0^{-1}).$$

When the candidate model is correctly specified, $\Sigma_0 = \Gamma_0$, i.e. $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_0) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} N(0, \Gamma_0^{-1})$. The reason is because the correctly specified model gives the equation

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{n}E\Big[\Big\{\sum_{j=1}^{n}\big(Y_j - \partial b(X_j'\theta_0)\big)X_j\Big\}\Big\{\sum_{j=1}^{n}\big(Y_j - \partial b(X_j'\theta_0)\big)X_j\Big\}'\Big] \\
&= \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n}E\Big[E\big[\big(Y_j - \partial b(X_j'\theta_0)\big)^2|\mathcal{F}_{j-1}\vee\sigma(X_j)\big]X_jX_j'\Big] \\
&\quad + 2\sum_{i<j}\frac{1}{n}E\Big[\big(Y_i - \partial b(X_i'\theta_0)\big)E\big[\big(Y_j - \partial b(X_j'\theta_0)\big)|\mathcal{F}_{j-1}\vee\sigma(X_j)\big]X_iX_j'\Big] \\
&= \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n}E\Big[E_{\theta_0}\big[\big(Y_j - E_{\theta_0}[Y_j|X_j]\big)^2|X_j\big]X_jX_j'\Big] \\
&\quad + 2\sum_{i<j}\frac{1}{n}E\Big[\big(Y_i - \partial b(X_i'\theta_0)\big)E_{\theta_0}\big[\big(Y_j - E_{\theta_0}[Y_j|X_j]\big)|X_j\big]X_iX_j'\Big] \\
&= \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n}E\Big[\partial^2 b(X_j'\theta_0)X_jX_j'\Big] + 0 \\
&= \int \partial^2 b(x'\theta_0)xx'\nu(dx)
\end{aligned}$$

under Assumptions 2.1-2.5 and 2.9 (i).

Remark 2.11. Let Assumptions 2.2-2.5 and 2.9 (i) hold. The condition

$$\left|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n}E\big[\big(Y_j - \partial b(X_j'\theta_0)\big)^2X_jX_j'\big] - \Sigma_0\right| \to 0$$

implies Assumption 2.9 (ii), since it follows from this condition and Doukhan [13, Theorem 3] that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|\frac{1}{n}E\Big[\Big\{\sum_{j=1}^{n}\big(Y_j - \partial b(X_j'\theta_0)\big)X_j\Big\}\Big\{\sum_{j=1}^{n}\big(Y_j - \partial b(X_j'\theta_0)\big)X_j\Big\}'\Big] - \Sigma_0\right| \\
&\le \left|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n}E\big[\big(Y_j - \partial b(X_j'\theta_0)\big)^2X_jX_j'\big] - \Sigma_0\right| + \frac{2}{n}\sum_{i<j}\Big|\mathrm{cov}\big[\big(Y_i - \partial b(X_i'\theta_0)\big)X_i, \big(Y_j - \partial b(X_j'\theta_0)\big)X_j\big]\Big| \\
&\lesssim \left|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n}E\big[\big(Y_j - \partial b(X_j'\theta_0)\big)^2X_jX_j'\big] - \Sigma_0\right| + \frac{2}{n}\sum_{i<j}\alpha(j-i) \to 0
\end{aligned}$$

as $n \to \infty$. □

3. Quasi-Bayesian information criterion for dependent GLM

3.1. **Stochastic expansion.** We use the GLM as our working model to choose the optimal model, so we consider the stochastic expansion of the marginal quasi-likelihood in GLM.

Assumption 3.1. $\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\big(F(X_j) - \partial b(X_j'\theta_0)\big)X_j = O_p(1)$.

The next theorem shows the asymptotic behavior of the log marginal quasi-likelihood function.

Theorem 3.2. *Assume that Assumptions 2.1-2.5 and 3.1 hold and that the following conditions are satisfied:*

(i) $\pi(\theta_0) > 0$, $\sup_{\theta\in\Theta} \pi(\theta) < \infty$.

(ii) *For every* $M > 0$, $\sup_{|u|<M} \left|\pi\left(\theta_0 + \frac{u}{\sqrt{n}}\right) - \pi(\theta_0)\right| \to 0$ *as* $n \to \infty$.

(iii) $\log \pi(\hat{\theta}_n) - \log \pi(\theta_0) = o_p(1)$.

Then we have the expansion

$$\begin{aligned}
&\log\left(\int_\Theta \exp\{\mathbb{H}_n(\theta)\}\pi(\theta)d\theta\right) \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^n \left(Y_j X_j'\hat{\theta}_n - b(X_j'\hat{\theta}_n)\right) - \frac{p}{2}\log n + \frac{p}{2}\log 2\pi - \frac{1}{2}\log\det\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n \partial^2 b(X_j'\hat{\theta}_n)X_jX_j'\right) + \log\pi(\hat{\theta}_n) + o_p(1) \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^n \left(Y_j X_j'\hat{\theta}_n - b(X_j'\hat{\theta}_n)\right) + \frac{p}{2}\log 2\pi - \frac{1}{2}\log\det\left(\sum_{j=1}^n \partial^2 b(X_j'\hat{\theta}_n)X_jX_j'\right) + \log\pi(\hat{\theta}_n) + o_p(1).
\end{aligned}$$

Remark 3.3. Suppose that we replace Assumptions 2.4 and 2.5 (ii) by the following conditions:

(i) $\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n \left(F(X_j)X_j'\theta - b(X_j'\theta)\right) \to \int \left(F(x)x'\theta - b(x'\theta)\right)\nu(dx)$ almost surely as $n \to \infty$, uniformly in $\theta \in \Theta$.

(ii) $\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n \partial^2 b(X_j'\theta)X_jX_j' \to \int \partial^2 b(x'\theta)xx'\nu(dx)$ almost surely as $n \to \infty$, uniformly in $\theta \in \Theta$.

(iii) For some constant $\lambda_0 > 0$, $P\left[\limsup_{n\to\infty} \lambda_{\min}\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n \underline{b}(X_j)X_jX_j'\right) < \lambda_0\right] = 0$.

Then, as in Cavanaugh and Neath [9, Section 3], we can show that the log marginal quasi-likelihood function almost surely satisfies the expansion similar to Theorem 3.2, i.e. almost surely

$$\begin{aligned}
\log\left(\int_\Theta \exp\{\mathbb{H}_n(\theta)\}\pi(\theta)d\theta\right) &= \sum_{j=1}^n \left(Y_j X_j'\hat{\theta}_n - b(X_j'\hat{\theta}_n)\right) - \frac{p}{2}\log n + \frac{p}{2}\log 2\pi \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{2}\log\det\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n \partial^2 b(X_j'\hat{\theta}_n)X_jX_j'\right) + \log\pi(\hat{\theta}_n) + o(1).
\end{aligned}$$

□

Due to Theorem 3.2, we define the quasi-Bayesian information criterion (QBIC) and BIC for dependent GLM by

$$\mathrm{QBIC} = -2\sum_{j=1}^n \left(Y_j X_j'\hat{\theta}_n - b(X_j'\hat{\theta}_n)\right) + \log\det\left(\sum_{j=1}^n \partial^2 b(X_j'\hat{\theta}_n)X_jX_j'\right)$$

and

$$\mathrm{BIC} = -2\sum_{j=1}^n \left(Y_j X_j'\hat{\theta}_n - b(X_j'\hat{\theta}_n)\right) + p\log n.$$

Let $\mathrm{QBIC}^{(1)}, \ldots, \mathrm{QBIC}^{(M)}$ be the QBIC for each candidate model. We calculate $\mathrm{QBIC}^{(1)}, \ldots, \mathrm{QBIC}^{(M)}$ and select the best model $\mathfrak{M}_{m_0}$ having the minimum-QBIC value:

$$m_0 = \underset{m\in\{1,\ldots,M\}}{\mathrm{argmin}}\ \mathrm{QBIC}^{(m)}.$$

We can also select the best model by using BIC in a similar manner. As directly seen by the definition, the QBIC have more computational load than the BIC. Since the QBIC involves the observed-information matrix quantity, which is directly computed from data, the QBIC would more effectively take data dependence into account. Furthermore, the penalty (second-term) of QBIC consists of the second derivative of

$\mathbb{H}_n$ with respect to θ, so the dimension of the parameter affects the penalty. That is, the QBIC considers the complexity of the model.

3.2. **Model selection consistency.** Let $\Theta_i \subset \mathbb{R}^{p_i}$ and $\Theta_j \subset \mathbb{R}^{p_j}$ be the parameter space associated with $\mathfrak{M}_i$ and $\mathfrak{M}_j$, respectively. If $p_i < p_j$ and there exist a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{p_j \times p_i}$ with $A'A = I_{p_i \times p_i}$ as well as a $c \in \mathbb{R}^{p_j}$ such that $\mathbb{H}_{i,n}(\theta) = \mathbb{H}_{j,n}(A\theta + c)$ for all $\theta \in \Theta_i$, we say that Θ_i is nested in Θ_j.

Under Assumptions 2.1-2.5, when m_0 satisfies

$$\{m_0\} = \operatorname*{argmin}_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \dim(\Theta_m),$$

where $\mathcal{M} = \operatorname{argmax}_{m\in\{1,\ldots,M\}} \mathbb{H}_{m,0}(\theta_{m,0}) = \operatorname{argmax}_{m\in\{1,\ldots,M\}} \int \big(F(x)x'\theta_{m,0} - b_m(x'\theta_{m,0})\big)\nu(dx)$, we say that $\mathfrak{M}_{m_0}$ is the *optimal* model.

Theorem 3.4. *Assume that Assumptions 2.1-2.5, 3.1 are satisfied and that there exists a unique $m_0 \in \{1,\ldots,M\}$ such that $\mathfrak{M}_{m_0}$ is the optimal model. For any fixed $m \in \{1,\ldots,M\}\backslash\{m_0\}$, if Θ_{m_0} is nested in Θ_m, or $\mathbb{H}_{m,0}(\theta) \neq \mathbb{H}_{m_0,0}(\theta_{m_0,0})$ for any $\theta \in \Theta_m$, then*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} P\big[\mathrm{QBIC}^{(m_0)} - \mathrm{QBIC}^{(m)} < 0\big] = 1.$$

This theorem implies that the probability that the optimal model is selected by using QBIC tends to 1 as $n \to \infty$. The probability that BIC choose the optimal model can be handled analogously.

4. Examples and Simulation results

In this section, we conduct simulations to evaluate finite sample performance of the model selection by using QBIC, BIC and formal AIC (fAIC). Since we do not deal with the theoretical part of AIC in this paper, we use the word fAIC as AIC, i.e. fAIC of mth model is defined by

$$\mathrm{fAIC}^{(m)} = -2\mathbb{H}_{m,n}(\hat{\theta}_{m,n}) + 2p_m.$$

Let θ^* be the true value. We here set the initial value as the value generated from uniform distribution $U(\theta^* - 1,\, \theta^* + 1)$ to use `optim` at software R for numerical optimization. Note that it may happens that $\theta_0 \neq \theta^*$ when the model is misspecified.

Remark 4.1. Since the true model is unknown in practice, we can not explicitly compute the optimal parameter and the optimal model. However, the QMLE, QBIC and BIC are computable by assuming specific candidate models. □

4.1. **Model selection in correctly specified model.** We assume that the explanatory variables $X_{j,1}, ..., X_{j,4}$ are given by

$$\begin{aligned}
&X_{j,1} = 1 \ (j \geq 1),\\
&X_{1,2} = 1,\ X_{j,2} = 0.5X_{j-1,2} + \epsilon_{j,2},\ (j \geq 2),\\
&X_{1,3} = 0,\ X_{j,3} = -0.7X_{j-1,3} + \epsilon_{j,3},\ (j \geq 2),\\
&X_{1,4} = -1,\ X_{j,4} = 0.8X_{j-1,4} + \epsilon_{j,4},\ (j \geq 2),
\end{aligned}$$

where the error vector $(\epsilon_{j,2}, \epsilon_{j,3}, \epsilon_{j,4}) \sim N(0, \Sigma)$ with $\Sigma = (0.5^{|k-\ell|})_{k,\ell=1,2,3}$. Moreover, the response variable Y_j is obtained from the true model defined by the linear logistic regression model

$$Y_j \sim B\left(1, \frac{\exp(X_j'\theta^*)}{1 + \exp(X_j'\theta^*)}\right), \tag{9}$$

where the true value $\theta^* = (0, -3, 0, 1)$ and $B(1, P)$ is a Bernoulli distribution with success probability P. We consider this model for the following combination of X_j:

Model 1 : $X_j = (X_{j,1}, X_{j,2}, X_{j,3}, X_{j,4})$; **Model 2** : $X_j = (X_{j,1}, X_{j,2}, X_{j,3})$;

Model 3 : $X_j = (X_{j,1}, X_{j,2}, X_{j,4})$; **Model 4** : $X_j = (X_{j,1}, X_{j,3}, X_{j,4})$; **Model 5** : $X_j = (X_{j,2}, X_{j,3}, X_{j,4})$;

Model 6 : $X_j = (X_{j,1}, X_{j,2})$; **Model 7** : $X_j = (X_{j,1}, X_{j,3})$; **Model 8** : $X_j = (X_{j,1}, X_{j,4})$;

TABLE 1. The number of models selected by QBIC, BIC and fAIC in Section 4.1 over 10000 simulations for various n (1-15 represent the models, and the true model is Model 10)

Criteria	$n=50$														
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10*	11	12	13	14	15
QBIC	1489	65	2084	0	1260	201	0	0	56	**4666**	0	0	172	0	0
BIC	99	18	531	0	562	222	0	0	86	**7720**	0	0	762	0	0
fAIC	479	55	1310	0	1424	192	0	0	93	**6242**	0	0	205	0	0
Criteria	$n=100$														
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10*	11	12	13	14	15
QBIC	298	2	1483	0	989	10	0	0	4	**7206**	0	0	8	0	0
BIC	19	1	323	0	397	15	0	0	8	**9179**	0	0	58	0	0
fAIC	347	1	1380	0	1367	7	0	0	2	**6895**	0	0	1	0	0
Criteria	$n=200$														
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10*	11	12	13	14	15
QBIC	86	0	910	0	616	0	0	0	0	**8388**	0	0	0	0	0
BIC	5	0	235	0	222	0	0	0	0	**9538**	0	0	0	0	0
fAIC	281	0	1314	0	1414	0	0	0	0	**6991**	0	0	0	0	0

Model 9 : $X_j = (X_{j,2}, X_{j,3})$; **Model 10** : $X_j = (X_{j,2}, X_{j,4})$; **Model 11** : $X_j = (X_{j,3}, X_{j,4})$;
Model 12 : $X_j = X_{j,1}$; **Model 13** : $X_j = X_{j,2}$; **Model 14** : $X_j = X_{j,3}$; **Model 15** : $X_j = X_{j,4}$.

Then the true model is Model 10, and Models 1, 3, 5 contain the true model. We simulate the number of the model selected by using QBIC, BIC and fAIC among the candidate Models 1-15 over 10000 simulations. For example, in the case of Model 1, QBIC, BIC and fAIC given by

$$\mathrm{QBIC} = -2\sum_{j=1}^{n}\left\{Y_j\sum_{i=1}^{4}X_{j,i}\hat{\theta}_i - \log\left(1+\exp\Big(\sum_{i=1}^{4}X_{j,i}\hat{\theta}_i\Big)\right)\right\} + \log\det\left(\sum_{j=1}^{n}\frac{\exp\Big(\sum_{i=1}^{4}X_{j,i}\hat{\theta}_i\Big)X_jX_j'}{\left(1+\exp\Big(\sum_{i=1}^{4}X_{j,i}\hat{\theta}_i\Big)\right)^2}\right)$$

$$\mathrm{BIC} = -2\sum_{j=1}^{n}\left\{Y_j\sum_{i=1}^{4}X_{j,i}\hat{\theta}_i - \log\left(1+\exp\Big(\sum_{i=1}^{4}X_{j,i}\hat{\theta}_i\Big)\right)\right\} + 4\log n,$$

$$\mathrm{fAIC} = -2\sum_{j=1}^{n}\left\{Y_j\sum_{i=1}^{4}X_{j,i}\hat{\theta}_i - \log\left(1+\exp\Big(\sum_{i=1}^{4}X_{j,i}\hat{\theta}_i\Big)\right)\right\} + 4\times 2.$$

In what follows, we verify the assumptions for QBIC (BIC). In the present situation, the function b defined in (4) is given by $b(\theta) = \log(1+e^{\theta})$, and Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2 are satisfied with $E[Y_j|\mathcal{F}_{j-1}\vee\sigma(X_j)] = F(X_j) = e^{-3X_{j,2}+X_{j,4}}/(1+e^{-3X_{j,2}+X_{j,4}})$. In particular, $\sup_{j\in\mathbb{N}}E\big[|X_j|^q\big] < \infty$ for every $q>0$. Moreover, the function $\underline{b}$ of Assumption 2.5 can be given by $\underline{b}(x) = e^{-C|x|}/(1+e^{C|x|})^2$ for some constant $C>0$ satisfying $\sup_{\theta\in\Theta}|x'\theta| \le C|x|$. If $\{(X_j,Y_j); j=1,2,\ldots\}$ has the exponential β-mixing property, Assumptions 2.3, 2.4 and 3.1 hold. Here the exponential β-mixing property of $\{(X_j,Y_j); j=1,2,\ldots\}$ is shown by Baraud *et al.* [4] and Doukhan [13, Section 2.4]. The validity of the assumptions of Sections 4.2 and 4.3 can be checked in a similar way.

Table 1 summarizes the comparison results of the frequency of the model selection. Model 10 is selected with high frequency for all criterions and n. Moreover, the probability that Model 10 is selected by QBIC and BIC becomes higher as n increases. In Table 2, the differences between the true value and the estimators in specified models are getting small when n gets increased. From these results, we can observe the consistency of the estimators and the model selection consistency of QBIC and BIC.

4.2. **Model selection in misspecified model.** We use the same conditions as in the previous section except for the true model. In this simulation, the response variable Y_j is obtained from the true model defined by

$$Y_j \sim B\Big(1, \Phi(X_j'\theta^*)\Big),$$

where $\Phi(x) = \int_{-\infty}^{x}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\exp(-\frac{t^2}{2})dt$. Then Models 1-15 are misspecified models.

TABLE 2. The mean and the standard deviation (s.d.) of estimators $\hat{\theta}_1$, $\hat{\theta}_2$, $\hat{\theta}_3$ and $\hat{\theta}_4$ in each model for various n (1-15 represent the models, and the true parameter $(\theta_1^*, \theta_2^*, \theta_3^*, \theta_4^*) = (0, -3, 0, 1)$)

		$n = 50$				$n = 100$				$n = 200$			
		$\hat{\theta}_1$	$\hat{\theta}_2$	$\hat{\theta}_3$	$\hat{\theta}_4$	$\hat{\theta}_1$	$\hat{\theta}_2$	$\hat{\theta}_3$	$\hat{\theta}_4$	$\hat{\theta}_1$	$\hat{\theta}_2$	$\hat{\theta}_3$	$\hat{\theta}_4$
1	mean	-0.0793	-8.3409	-0.0219	2.7990	0.0004	-3.3727	-0.0057	1.1266	0.0023	-3.1642	0.0004	1.0542
	s.d.	8.1943	35.1378	5.9571	12.8200	0.3895	0.8918	0.2889	0.3744	0.2425	0.4946	0.1807	0.2123
2	mean	-0.0505	-2.7481	0.1061	–	-0.0425	-2.1878	0.0867	–	-0.0167	-2.0734	0.0856	–
	s.d.	2.0544	7.9339	1.3571	–	0.4653	0.5332	0.2141	–	0.3146	0.3336	0.1395	–
3	mean	0.0355	-5.7372	–	1.8913	0.0001	-3.2941	–	1.0993	0.0021	-3.1332	–	1.0441
	s.d.	4.6176	23.3197	–	8.1816	0.3763	0.8210	–	0.3508	0.2397	0.4804	–	0.2078
4	mean	-0.0999	–	-0.2581	0.3139	-0.0451	–	-0.2364	0.2852	-0.0168	–	-0.2250	0.2746
	s.d.	0.4791	–	0.2318	0.3193	0.3109	–	0.1453	0.1940	0.2100	–	0.0976	0.1264
5	mean	–	-5.6381	0.0219	1.8650	–	-3.2928	-0.0052	1.0989	–	-3.1336	0.0003	1.0442
	s.d.	–	22.5995	3.7461	7.8695	–	0.8333	0.2792	0.3465	–	0.4835	0.1787	0.2057
6	mean	-0.0635	-2.4621	–	–	-0.0429	-2.1293	–	–	-0.0169	-2.0324	–	–
	s.d.	1.8364	4.1725	–	–	0.4578	0.5074	–	–	0.3127	0.3232	–	–
7	mean	-0.1086	–	-0.1960	–	-0.0518	–	-0.1808	–	-0.0217	–	-0.1723	–
	s.d.	0.4591	–	0.2093	–	0.3188	–	0.1351	–	0.2227	–	0.0921	–
8	mean	-0.1006	–	–	0.2681	-0.0453	–	–	0.2483	-0.0170	–	–	0.2415
	s.d.	0.4660	–	–	0.3022	0.3063	–	–	0.1875	0.2081	–	–	0.1230
9	mean	–	-2.3773	0.1058	–	–	-2.1041	0.0878	–	–	-2.0342	0.0860	–
	s.d.	–	5.2112	1.0538	–	–	0.5008	0.2061	–	–	0.3263	0.1372	–
10*	mean	–	-4.2068	–	1.3952	–	-3.2211	–	1.0741	–	-3.1037	–	1.0344
	s.d.	–	13.1535	–	4.3787	–	0.7702	–	0.3259	–	0.4699	–	0.2013
11	mean	–	–	-0.2546	0.3124	–	–	-0.2350	0.2855	–	–	-0.2243	0.2747
	s.d.	–	–	0.2218	0.2851	–	–	0.1424	0.1840	–	–	0.0967	0.1230
12	mean	-0.0695	–	–	–	-0.0368	–	–	–	-0.0179	–	–	–
	s.d.	0.3186	–	–	–	0.2548	–	–	–	0.1936	–	–	–
13	mean	–	-2.6475	–	–	–	-2.5688	–	–	–	-2.5278	–	–
	s.d.	–	0.3694	–	–	–	0.3052	–	–	–	0.2789	–	–
14	mean	–	–	-0.1525	–	–	–	-0.1528	–	–	–	-0.1517	–
	s.d.	–	–	0.1694	–	–	–	0.1218	–	–	–	0.0901	–
15	mean	–	–	–	0.5703	–	–	–	0.5507	–	–	–	0.5394
	s.d.	–	–	–	0.2553	–	–	–	0.2478	–	–	–	0.2477

TABLE 3. The number of models selected by QBIC, BIC and fAIC in Section 4.2 over 10000 simulations for various n (1-15 represent the models)

Criteria	$n = 100$														
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
QBIC	965	0	2025	0	1321	0	0	0	0	5689	0	0	0	0	0
BIC	41	0	435	0	398	0	0	0	0	9125	0	0	1	0	0
fAIC	443	0	1452	0	1538	0	0	0	0	6567	0	0	0	0	0
Criteria	$n = 200$														
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
QBIC	223	0	1338	0	915	0	0	0	0	7524	0	0	0	0	0
BIC	9	0	278	0	274	0	0	0	0	9439	0	0	0	0	0
fAIC	349	0	1436	0	1414	0	0	0	0	6801	0	0	0	0	0
Criteria	$n = 300$														
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
QBIC	108	0	1009	0	694	0	0	0	0	8189	0	0	0	0	0
BIC	5	0	190	0	216	0	0	0	0	9589	0	0	0	0	0
fAIC	295	0	1352	0	1388	0	0	0	0	6965	0	0	0	0	0

From Table 3, we obtain similar results even though the candidate models do not include the true model. Table 4 summarizes the mean and the standard deviation of estimators in each model. Since the optimal parameter value is not given here, we can not see the differences between the optimal parameter value and the estimators, although the standard deviations become smaller when n become larger.

4.3. **Model selection in univariate time series model.** Let $X_j = (Z_j, Z_{j-1}, \ldots, Z_{j-(p-1)})'$ be the explanatory vector for any $j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, where for every $i \in \{2, \ldots, n\}$, Z_i is given by

$$Z_{-n+2} = \cdots = Z_0 = 0,\ Z_1 = 1,\ Z_i = 0.6Z_{i-1} + \epsilon_i,$$

TABLE 4. The mean and the standard deviation (s.d.) of estimators $\hat{\theta}_1$, $\hat{\theta}_2$, $\hat{\theta}_3$ and $\hat{\theta}_4$ in each model for various n (1-15 represent the models)

		$n=100$				$n=300$				$n=300$			
		$\hat{\theta}_1$	$\hat{\theta}_2$	$\hat{\theta}_3$	$\hat{\theta}_4$	$\hat{\theta}_1$	$\hat{\theta}_2$	$\hat{\theta}_3$	$\hat{\theta}_4$	$\hat{\theta}_1$	$\hat{\theta}_2$	$\hat{\theta}_3$	$\hat{\theta}_4$
1	mean	0.0020	7.6472	-0.0028	-2.5525	-0.0031	5.8988	-0.0009	-1.9640	0.0038	5.6861	-0.0006	-1.8975
	s.d.	1.7319	14.4366	1.2513	5.0473	0.3440	1.1541	0.2541	0.4378	0.2599	0.8285	0.1914	0.3118
2	mean	0.0596	2.8857	-0.1171	–	0.0255	2.6805	-0.1079	–	0.0176	2.6080	-0.1066	–
	s.d.	0.5917	0.7518	0.2335	–	0.3873	0.4610	0.1501	–	0.3069	0.3574	0.1168	–
3	mean	0.0104	6.7840	–	-2.2605	-0.0030	5.7925	–	-1.9290	0.0036	5.6262	–	-1.8772
	s.d.	1.0092	9.8524	–	3.4170	0.3351	1.0856	–	0.4150	0.2561	0.8056	–	0.3038
4	mean	0.0525	–	0.2555	-0.3135	0.0218	–	0.2448	-0.2959	0.0157	–	0.2415	-0.2931
	s.d.	0.3315	–	0.1409	0.2024	0.2209	–	0.0938	0.1314	0.1781	–	0.0756	0.1048
5	mean	–	6.7809	0.0061	-2.2594	–	5.7915	-0.0008	-1.9285	–	5.6255	-0.0007	-1.8771
	s.d.	–	9.5017	0.8186	3.3869	–	1.0916	0.2479	0.4130	–	0.8008	0.1886	0.3009
6	mean	0.0594	2.7967	–	–	0.0256	2.6226	–	–	0.0177	2.5586	–	–
	s.d.	0.5801	0.7108	–	–	0.3839	0.4437	–	–	0.3053	0.3487	–	–
7	mean	0.0619	–	0.1933	–	0.0276	–	0.1866	–	0.0189	–	0.1838	–
	s.d.	0.3385	–	0.1298	–	0.2324	–	0.0877	–	0.1902	–	0.0712	–
8	mean	0.0527	–	–	-0.2728	0.0220	–	–	-0.2591	0.0158	–	–	-0.2574
	s.d.	0.3260	–	–	0.1951	0.2182	–	–	0.1276	0.1761	–	–	0.1019
9	mean	–	2.7283	-0.1163	–	–	2.6104	-0.1073	–	–	2.5642	-0.1064	–
	s.d.	–	0.6923	0.2218	–	–	0.4446	0.1466	–	–	0.3506	0.1151	–
10	mean	–	6.2763	–	-2.0919	–	5.6925	–	-1.8959	–	5.5676	–	-1.8575
	s.d.	–	6.7882	–	2.4910	–	1.0309	–	0.3934	–	0.7797	–	0.2936
11	mean	–	–	0.2535	-0.3120	–	–	0.2438	-0.2954	–	–	0.2409	-0.2929
	s.d.	–	–	0.1375	0.1922	–	–	0.0927	0.1277	–	–	0.0751	0.1028
12	mean	0.0457	–	–	–	0.0218	–	–	–	0.0165	–	–	–
	s.d.	0.2639	–	–	–	0.1971	–	–	–	0.1677	–	–	–
13	mean	–	2.7922	–	–	–	2.7190	–	–	–	2.6821	–	–
	s.d.	–	0.3799	–	–	–	0.3080	–	–	–	0.2692	–	–
14	mean	–	–	0.1636	–	–	–	0.1630	–	–	–	0.1631	–
	s.d.	–	–	0.1182	–	–	–	0.0885	–	–	–	0.0756	–
15	mean	–	–	–	-0.5569	–	–	–	-0.5398	–	–	–	-0.5376
	s.d.	–	–	–	0.2432	–	–	–	0.2439	–	–	–	0.2466

where $\epsilon_i \sim N(0,1)$. The response variable Y_j is obtained from the true model defined by

$$Y_j \sim B\left(1, \frac{\exp(X_j'\theta^*)}{1+\exp(X_j'\theta^*)}\right), \tag{10}$$

where the true value $\theta^* = (3,-1,2,1)$. For simplicity, we here focus on the hierarchical models as the candidate models:

$$\textbf{Model 1}: X_j = (Z_j);\ \textbf{Model 2}: X_j = (Z_j, Z_{j-1});\ \textbf{Model 3}: X_j = (Z_j, Z_{j-1}, Z_{j-2});$$
$$\textbf{Model 4}: X_j = (Z_j, Z_{j-1}, Z_{j-2}, Z_{j-3});\ \textbf{Model 5}: X_j = (Z_j, Z_{j-1}, Z_{j-2}, Z_{j-3}, Z_{j-4});\ \cdots.$$

Then the true mode is Model 4.

We simulate the number of the model selected by using QBIC, BIC and fAIC among the candidate models over 10000 simulations. First, we calculate $\mathrm{QBIC}^{(1)}$ and $\mathrm{QBIC}^{(2)}$. If $\mathrm{QBIC}^{(1)} < \mathrm{QBIC}^{(2)}$, Model 1 is selected as the best model. When $\mathrm{QBIC}^{(1)} \geq \mathrm{QBIC}^{(2)}$, we calculate $\mathrm{QBIC}^{(3)}$ and compare $\mathrm{QBIC}^{(2)}$ with $\mathrm{QBIC}^{(3)}$. We repeat similar procedures to stop at the best model. Furthermore, we select the best model by BIC and fAIC in a similar manner.

Table 5 summarizes the comparison results of the frequency of the model selection. The best model is searched among Models 1-11 for all cases. Model 4 is selected with the highest frequency as the best model. Moreover, the frequency that Model 4 is selected by QBIC and BIC is getting higher when n gets increased. From this result, we can observe that QBIC and BIC have the consistency for model selection. In Table 6, the differences between the true value and the estimators in specified models (Models 4-6) become smaller as n becomes larger, and the standard deviations have the same tendency. Hence, the consistency of the estimators can be observed.

Remark 4.2. If $\{Z_j; j = 1,2,\ldots\}$ is a Markov chain of finite order, the situation of this section is included in the original model setting given in Section 2. □

Remark 4.3. If we assume the time series structure of $\{Z_j\}$, such as the autoregressive structure, we can treat the choice of the time-lag p only by observation data of $\{Z_j\}$. However, we here use the GLM as our

TABLE 5. The number of models selected by QBIC, BIC and fAIC in Section 4.3 over 10000 simulations for various n (1-11 represent the models, and the true model is Model 4)

Criteria					$n = 100$							
	1	2	3	4*	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
QBIC	2811	0	621	**4790**	1230	389	116	39	2	1	1	0
BIC	4132	0	1787	**3884**	186	10	1	0	0	0	0	0
fAIC	1	0	539	**6079**	2220	832	235	84	18	1	0	1
Criteria					$n = 200$							
	1	2	3	4*	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
QBIC	1412	0	137	**7288**	1012	130	19	1	1	0	0	0
BIC	2229	0	537	**7059**	170	3	2	0	0	0	0	0
fAIC	0	0	44	**6601**	2311	770	207	52	12	2	1	0
Criteria					$n = 300$							
	1	2	3	4*	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
QBIC	788	0	24	**8263**	836	86	3	0	0	0	0	0
BIC	1252	0	131	**8449**	166	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
fAIC	0	0	3	**6749**	2329	695	167	49	6	2	0	0

TABLE 6. The mean and the standard deviation (s.d.) of estimators $\hat{\theta}_1$, $\hat{\theta}_2$, $\hat{\theta}_3$, $\hat{\theta}_4$, $\hat{\theta}_5$ and $\hat{\theta}_6$ in each model for various n (1-6 represent the models, and the true parameter $(\theta_1^*, \theta_2^*, \theta_3^*, \theta_4^*) = (3, -1, 2, 1)$)

					$n = 100$		
		$\hat{\theta}_1$	$\hat{\theta}_2$	$\hat{\theta}_3$	$\hat{\theta}_4$	$\hat{\theta}_5$	$\hat{\theta}_6$
1	mean	2.5172	–	–	–	–	–
	s.d.	0.2870	–	–	–	–	–
2	mean	1.6640	0.2999	–	–	–	–
	s.d.	0.4144	0.2984	–	–	–	–
3	mean	2.9344	-0.9739	2.5388	–	–	–
	s.d.	1.6998	0.6616	1.6373	–	–	–
4*	mean	3.6868	-1.2316	2.4792	1.2357	–	–
	s.d.	4.7146	1.8259	3.7514	1.9396	–	–
5	mean	4.0140	-1.3648	2.6861	1.3428	0.0084	–
	s.d.	7.1375	3.3559	5.1527	2.5983	1.3582	–
6	mean	4.3051	-1.4502	2.8596	1.4699	-0.0248	0.0181
	s.d.	9.2106	3.8772	6.0818	3.8938	2.1885	1.3463
					$n = 200$		
		$\hat{\theta}_1$	$\hat{\theta}_2$	$\hat{\theta}_3$	$\hat{\theta}_4$	$\hat{\theta}_5$	$\hat{\theta}_6$
1	mean	2.5047	–	–	–	–	–
	s.d.	0.2872	–	–	–	–	–
2	mean	1.6112	0.2946	–	–	–	–
	s.d.	0.2703	0.1986	–	–	–	–
3	mean	2.7455	-0.9144	2.3777	–	–	–
	s.d.	0.4856	0.3301	0.4465	–	–	–
4*	mean	3.2248	-1.0726	2.1506	1.0782	–	–
	s.d.	0.6262	0.3792	0.5081	0.3492	–	–
5	mean	3.2692	-1.0873	2.1804	1.0957	-0.0029	–
	s.d.	0.6508	0.3889	0.5250	0.4033	0.3008	–
6	mean	3.2998	-1.0937	2.1975	1.1106	-0.0045	-0.0010
	s.d.	0.6743	0.4020	0.5389	0.4199	0.3621	0.3081
					$n = 300$		
		$\hat{\theta}_1$	$\hat{\theta}_2$	$\hat{\theta}_3$	$\hat{\theta}_4$	$\hat{\theta}_5$	$\hat{\theta}_6$
1	mean	2.5001	–	–	–	–	–
	s.d.	0.2878	–	–	–	–	–
2	mean	1.5930	0.2921	–	–	–	–
	s.d.	0.2184	0.1615	–	–	–	–
3	mean	2.6986	-0.9016	2.3370	–	–	–
	s.d.	0.3753	0.2669	0.3494	–	–	–
4*	mean	3.1478	-1.0509	2.1000	1.0516	–	–
	s.d.	0.4761	0.3026	0.3904	0.2718	–	–
5	mean	3.1738	-1.0590	2.1168	1.0628	-0.0039	–
	s.d.	0.4864	0.3074	0.3980	0.3100	0.2321	–
6	mean	3.1914	-1.0619	2.1249	1.0725	-0.0090	0.0043
	s.d.	0.5053	0.3177	0.4114	0.3209	0.2803	0.2353

working model and solely focus on the contribution of $\{Z_j\}$ to $\mathbf{Y}_n$ through the conditional distribution, so that the Bayesian model selection is possible even if the distribution of $\{Z_j\}$ itself is not explicitly specified. □

5. Real data example

We apply the QBIC, BIC and fAIC for the analysis of the meteorological data, which can be found at the Homepage of Japan Meteorological Agency (http://www.jma.go.jp/jma/indexe.html). In this section, we deal with the data that were obtained during a period of 11 years from January 2000 to December 2010 at Yonagunijima, Japan. The data include monthly total of precipitation $(P)_t$, monthly mean of temperature $(T)_t$, monthly mean of carbon dioxide $(CO_2)_t$, monthly mean of methane $(CH_4)_t$, monthly mean of carbon monoxide $(CO)_t$ and monthly mean of ozone $(O_3)_t$, where $t = -11, \ldots, -1, 0, 1, \ldots, 120$. The series Y_t is given by the seasonal difference of precipitation

$$Y_t = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } (P)_t - (P)_{t-12} \geq 0 \\ 0, & \text{if } (P)_t - (P)_{t-12} < 0 \end{cases}$$

$t = 1, \ldots, 120$. In the parameter estimation and the model selection, we use the linear logistic regression model

$$Y_t \sim B\bigg(1, \frac{\exp(X_{t-1}'\theta)}{1+\exp(X_{t-1}'\theta)}\bigg),$$

and X_t has the following elements in each candidate model:

Model 1 : $X_t = (X_{t,1}, X_{t,2}, X_{t,3}, X_{t,4}, X_{t,5})$; **Model 2** : $X_t = (X_{t,1}, X_{t,2}, X_{t,3}X_{t,4})$;

Model 3 : $X_t = (X_{t,1}, X_{t,2}, X_{t,3}, X_{t,5})$; **Model 4** : $X_t = (X_{t,1}, X_{t,2}, X_{t,4}, X_{t,5})$;

Model 5 : $X_t = (X_{t,1}, X_{t,3}, X_{t,4}, X_{t,5})$; $\cdots$; **Model 26** : $X_t = (X_{t,4}, X_{t,5})$; $\cdots$; **Model 31** : $X_t = X_{t,5}$,

Here, $X_{t,1}, X_{t,2}, X_{t,3}, X_{t,4}$ and $X_{t,5}$ are given by normalizing $(T)_t$, $(CO_2)_t$, $(CH_4)_t$, $(CO)_t$ and $(O_3)_t$, respectively.

The estimators and the values of QBIC, BIC and fAIC are shown in Table 7. By comparison the calculation results of QBIC and fAIC, Model 26, which consists of $X_{t,4}$ and $X_{t,5}$, is selected as the best model. On the other hand, the calculation results of BIC imply that Model 31, which consists of $X_{t,5}$, is chosen. Note that Model 26 contains Model 31. These results mean that $(CO)_t$ and $(O_3)_t$ are more significant than $(T)_t$, $(CO_2)_t$ and $(CH_4)_t$ for the consideration of the seasonal difference of precipitation.

6. Proofs

We will make use of the the next three lemmas. The proofs of Lemmas 6.1-6.3, Theorems 2.8 and 2.10 are given in Supplementary Material. Recall that ψ_j is given by $\psi_j = \big(Y_j - F(X_j)\big)X_j$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$.

Lemma 6.1. *Assume that Assumptions 2.2 and 2.3 are satisfied and that* $\sup_{j\in\mathbb{N}} \|\psi_j\|_2 < \infty$*, then*

$$\sup_{n>0} \frac{1}{n} E\bigg[\sup_{1\leq i\leq n} \bigg|\sum_{j=1}^{i} \psi_j\bigg|^2\bigg] < \infty.$$

We write $\Delta_n = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\partial_\theta \mathbb{H}_n(\theta_0) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\big(Y_j - \partial b(X_j'\theta_0)\big)X_j$.

Lemma 6.2. *Assume that Assumptions 2.1-2.5 and 3.1 are satisfied, then the following claims are established:*

(i) $\Delta_n = O_p(1)$.

(ii) $\sup_{\theta\in\Theta}\bigg|\frac{1}{n\sqrt{n}}\partial_\theta^3 \mathbb{H}_n(\theta)\bigg| = o_p(1)$.

We write $\mathbb{U}_n(\theta_0) = \big\{u \in \mathbb{R}^p; \theta_0 + \frac{u}{\sqrt{n}} \in \Theta\big\}$ and $\mathbb{Z}_n(u) = \exp\Big\{\mathbb{H}_n\Big(\theta_0 + \frac{u}{\sqrt{n}}\Big) - \mathbb{H}_n(\theta_0)\Big\}$.

Lemma 6.3. *If Assumptions 2.1-2.5 and 3.1 hold, then*

$$\int_{\mathbb{U}_n(\theta_0)\cap\{|u|\geq M_n\}} \mathbb{Z}_n(u)du = o_p(1)$$

for any $M_n \to \infty$.

TABLE 7. The estimators and the values of QBIC, BIC and fAIC in each model (1-31 represent the models)

	Estimators					Criteria		
	$(T)_t$ $\hat{\theta}_1$	$(CO_2)_t$ $\hat{\theta}_2$	$(CH_4)_t$ $\hat{\theta}_3$	$(CO)_t$ $\hat{\theta}_4$	$(O_3)_t$ $\hat{\theta}_5$	QBIC	BIC	fAIC
1	-0.1328	0.0903	-0.3482	0.5266	-0.4888	173.9913	186.2375	172.3000
2	-0.2615	0.1934	-0.6884	0.2529	–	173.6681	182.6151	171.4651
3	-0.4314	0.0927	-0.3403	–	-0.2720	173.7480	182.4788	171.3288
4	-0.0210	-0.0254	–	0.5321	-0.6850	173.1102	181.8313	170.6813
5	-0.1137	–	-0.2385	0.5385	-0.5630	171.2799	181.5201	170.3702
6	–	0.0557	-0.2633	0.6259	-0.5396	172.4866	181.5337	170.3838
7	-0.4119	0.1726	-0.5915	–	–	172.3932	178.1460	169.7835
8	-0.0167	0.0200	–	-0.0591	–	174.8113	180.6593	172.2968
9	-0.3163	-0.0057	–	–	-0.4567	172.8990	178.1106	169.7482
10	-0.2325	–	-0.5170	0.1859	–	171.4395	178.6055	170.2430
11	-0.4111	–	-0.2185	–	-0.3449	171.0992	177.8327	169.4702
12	-0.0154	–	–	0.5260	-0.6796	169.8614	177.0610	168.6985
13	–	0.1825	-0.6038	0.4180	–	172.3837	178.1883	169.8259
14	–	0.0434	0.0045	–	-0.2272	173.2589	179.2828	170.9203
15	–	-0.0246	–	0.5506	-0.6846	171.3291	177.0464	168.6839
16	–	–	-0.1973	0.6239	-0.5848	169.7155	176.7985	168.4360
17	0.0357	0.0193	–	–	–	173.0224	175.8931	170.3181
18	-0.3488	–	-0.4575	–	–	169.9879	173.9960	168.4211
19	-0.0210	–	–	-0.0578	–	171.5117	175.8827	170.3077
20	-0.3142	–	–	–	-0.4557	169.6164	173.3240	167.7491
21	–	0.1120	-0.2194	–	–	171.7523	174.8190	169.2441
22	–	0.0204	–	-0.0436	–	173.0122	175.8735	170.2985
23	–	0.0448	–	–	-0.2237	171.6428	174.4954	168.9204
24	–	–	-0.4511	0.3383	–	170.0575	174.1061	168.5311
25	–	–	0.0548	–	-0.2628	170.4487	174.5279	168.9530
26	–	–	–	0.5398	-0.6794	**168.0681**	172.2750	**166.7000**
27	0.0302	–	–	–	–	169.7206	171.1156	168.3281
28	–	0.0092	–	–	–	169.7456	171.1403	168.3528
29	–	–	-0.1669	–	–	168.9109	170.3210	167.5335
30	–	–	–	-0.0388	–	169.7026	171.0980	168.3105
31	–	–	–	–	-0.2165	168.3457	**169.7660**	166.9785

6.1. **Proof of Theorem 3.2.** In what follows, we consider the zero-extended version of $\mathbb{Z}_n$ and use the same notation:

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^p \setminus \mathbb{U}_n(\theta_0)} \mathbb{Z}_n(u)du = 0.$$

By using the change of variable $\theta = \theta_0 + \frac{u}{\sqrt{n}}$, the log marginal quasi-likelihood function becomes

$$\begin{aligned}\log\left(\int_\Theta \exp\{\mathbb{H}_n(\theta)\}\pi(\theta)d\theta\right) &= \mathbb{H}_n(\theta_0) - \frac{p}{2}\log n + \log\left\{\int_{\mathbb{U}_n(\theta_0)} \mathbb{Z}_n(u)\pi\Big(\theta_0 + \frac{u}{\sqrt{n}}\Big)du\right\} \\ &= \mathbb{H}_n(\theta_0) - \frac{p}{2}\log n \\ &\quad + \log\left\{\int_{\mathbb{U}_n(\theta_0)} \mathbb{Z}_n(u)\left(\pi\Big(\theta_0 + \frac{u}{\sqrt{n}}\Big) - \pi(\theta_0)\right)du + \pi(\theta_0)\int_{\mathbb{R}^p}\mathbb{Z}_n(u)du\right\}.\end{aligned}$$

First we consider the asymptotic behavior of $\int_{\mathbb{U}_n(\theta_0)} \mathbb{Z}_n(u)\big(\pi(\theta_0 + \frac{u}{\sqrt{n}}) - \pi(\theta_0)\big)du$. Because of (ii) of Theorem 3.2, Assumption 2.5 (i) and Lemma 6.3, we can take $M > 0$ large enough so that

$$\left|\int_{\mathbb{U}_n(\theta_0)} \mathbb{Z}_n(u)\left(\pi\Big(\theta_0 + \frac{u}{\sqrt{n}}\Big) - \pi(\theta_0)\right)du\right|$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\le \int_{\mathbb{U}_n(\theta_0)} \mathbb{Z}_n(u)\left|\pi\Big(\theta_0+\frac{u}{\sqrt{n}}\Big)-\pi(\theta_0)\right|du \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{U}_n(\theta_0)\cap\{|u|<M\}} \mathbb{Z}_n(u)\left|\pi\Big(\theta_0+\frac{u}{\sqrt{n}}\Big)-\pi(\theta_0)\right|du + \int_{\mathbb{U}_n(\theta_0)\cap\{|u|\ge M\}} \mathbb{Z}_n(u)\left|\pi\Big(\theta_0+\frac{u}{\sqrt{n}}\Big)-\pi(\theta_0)\right|du \\
&\le (2M)^p \sup_{|u|<M}\left|\pi\Big(\theta_0+\frac{u}{\sqrt{n}}\Big)-\pi(\theta_0)\right| \sup_{|u|<M}\mathbb{Z}_n(u) + 2\sup_{\theta\in\Theta}\pi(\theta)\int_{\mathbb{U}_n(\theta_0)\cap\{|u|\ge M\}}\mathbb{Z}_n(u)du \\
&= o_p(1)\times\sup_{|u|<M}\left\{\exp\left(u'\Delta_n-\frac{1}{2}u'\Big(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n\partial^2 b(X_j'\tilde{\theta}_n)X_jX_j'\Big)u\right)\right\}+O_p(1)\times o_p(1) \\
&\le o_p(1)\times\sup_{|u|<M}\left\{\exp\left(u'\Delta_n-\frac{1}{2}u'\Big(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n\underline{b}(X_j)X_jX_j'\Big)u\right)\right\}+o_p(1),
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\tilde{\theta}_n=\theta_0+\xi\frac{u}{\sqrt{n}}$ for some ξ satisfying $0<\xi<1$. Since $\frac{\partial}{\partial u}\{u'\Delta_n-\frac{1}{2}u'(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n\underline{b}(X_j)X_jX_j')u)\}=0$ if and only if $u=\big(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n\underline{b}(X_j)X_jX_j'\big)^{-1}\Delta_n$, we have

$$
u'\Delta_n-\frac{1}{2}u'\Big(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n\underline{b}(X_j)X_jX_j'\Big)u\le\frac{1}{2}\Delta_n'\Big(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n\underline{b}(X_j)X_jX_j'\Big)^{-1}\Delta_n.
$$

From Assumption 2.5 (ii) and Lemma 6.2 (i), for any $\epsilon>0$ and for some $L>0$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\limsup_{n\to\infty}P\Big[\sup_{|u|<M}\left\{\exp\left(u'\Delta_n-\frac{1}{2}u'\Big(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n\underline{b}(X_j)X_jX_j'\Big)u\right)\right\}>L\Big] \\
&\le \limsup_{n\to\infty}P\Big[\exp\Big\{\frac{1}{2}\Delta_n'\Big(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n\underline{b}(X_j)X_jX_j'\Big)^{-1}\Delta_n\Big\}>L;\lambda_{\min}\Big(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n\underline{b}(X_j)X_jX_j'\Big)<\lambda_0\Big] \\
&\quad+\limsup_{n\to\infty}P\Big[\exp\Big\{\frac{1}{2}\Delta_n'\Big(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n\underline{b}(X_j)X_jX_j'\Big)^{-1}\Delta_n\Big\}>L;\lambda_{\min}\Big(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n\underline{b}(X_j)X_jX_j'\Big)\ge\lambda_0\Big] \\
&\le \limsup_{n\to\infty}P\Big[\lambda_{\min}\Big(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n\underline{b}(X_j)X_jX_j'\Big)<\lambda_0\Big]+\limsup_{n\to\infty}P\Big[\exp\Big\{\frac{1}{2\lambda_0}\Delta_n'\Delta_n\Big\}>L\Big] \\
&<\epsilon, \qquad (11)
\end{aligned}
$$

so that $\sup_{|u|<M}\{\exp(u'\Delta_n-\frac{1}{2}u'(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n\underline{b}(X_j)X_jX_j')u)\}=O_p(1)$. Hence, $\int_{\mathbb{U}_n(\theta_0)}\mathbb{Z}_n(u)\Big(\pi\big(\theta_0+\frac{u}{\sqrt{n}}\big)-\pi(\theta_0)\Big)$ converges to 0 in probability.

Next we will prove that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^p}\mathbb{Z}_n(u)du=\int_{\mathbb{R}^p}\exp(u'\Delta_n-\frac{1}{2}u'\Gamma_nu)du+o_p(1)$. For each $K>0$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\left|\int_{\mathbb{R}^p}\mathbb{Z}_n(u)du-\int_{\mathbb{R}^p}\exp\Big(u'\Delta_n-\frac{1}{2}u'\Gamma_nu\Big)du\right| \\
&\le\int_{\mathbb{R}^p}\left|\mathbb{Z}_n(u)-\exp\Big(u'\Delta_n-\frac{1}{2}u'\Gamma_nu\Big)\right|du \\
&=\int_{|u|<K}\left|\mathbb{Z}_n(u)-\exp\Big(u'\Delta_n-\frac{1}{2}u'\Gamma_nu\Big)\right|du+\int_{|u|\ge K}\left|\mathbb{Z}_n(u)-\exp\Big(u'\Delta_n-\frac{1}{2}u'\Gamma_nu\Big)\right|du.
\end{aligned}
$$

Due to Assumption 2.5 and Lemma 6.3, we can take K large enough so that

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\int_{|u|\ge K}\left|\mathbb{Z}_n(u)-\exp\Big(u'\Delta_n-\frac{1}{2}u'\Gamma_nu\Big)\right|du \\
&\le\int_{|u|\ge K}\mathbb{Z}_n(u)du+\int_{|u|\ge K}\exp\left\{u'\Delta_n-\frac{1}{2}u'\Big(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n\partial^2 b(X_j'\theta_0)X_jX_j'\Big)u\right\}du \\
&\lesssim\int_{|u|\ge K}\exp\left\{u'\Delta_n-\frac{1}{2}u'\Big(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n\underline{b}(X_j)X_jX_j'\Big)u\right\}du=o_p(1).
\end{aligned}
$$

In the same way as (11), for the same K,

$$
\int_{|u|<K}\left|\mathbb{Z}_n(u)-\exp\Big(u'\Delta_n-\frac{1}{2}u'\Gamma_nu\Big)\right|du
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\lesssim \sup_{|u|<K}\left|\exp\Big(u'\Delta_n-\frac{1}{2}u'\Gamma_n u\Big)\Big\{\exp\left(\frac{1}{6}\sum_{i,k,\ell=1}^{p}\frac{1}{n\sqrt{n}}\partial_{\theta_i}\partial_{\theta_k}\partial_{\theta_\ell}\mathbb{H}_n(\tilde{\theta}_n)u_iu_ku_\ell\right)-1\Big\}\right|\\
&=\sup_{|u|<K}\exp\left(u'\Delta_n-\frac{1}{2}u'\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\partial^2 b(X_j'\theta_0)X_jX_j'\right)u\right)\left|\exp\left(\frac{1}{6}\sum_{i,k,\ell=1}^{p}\frac{1}{n\sqrt{n}}\partial_{\theta_i}\partial_{\theta_k}\partial_{\theta_\ell}\mathbb{H}_n(\tilde{\theta}_n)u_iu_ku_\ell\right)-1\right|\\
&\le\sup_{|u|<K}\exp\left(u'\Delta_n-\frac{1}{2}u'\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\underline{b}(X_j)X_jX_j'\right)u\right)\left|\exp\left(\frac{1}{6}\sum_{i,k,\ell=1}^{p}\frac{1}{n\sqrt{n}}\partial_{\theta_i}\partial_{\theta_k}\partial_{\theta_\ell}\mathbb{H}_n(\tilde{\theta}_n)u_iu_ku_\ell\right)-1\right|\\
&\le\exp\left\{\frac{1}{2}\Delta_n'\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\underline{b}(X_j)X_jX_j'\right)^{-1}\Delta_n\right\}\sup_{|u|<K}\left|\exp\left(\frac{1}{6}\sum_{i,k,\ell=1}^{p}\frac{1}{n\sqrt{n}}\partial_{\theta_i}\partial_{\theta_k}\partial_{\theta_\ell}\mathbb{H}_n(\tilde{\theta}_n)u_iu_ku_\ell\right)-1\right|\\
&=O_p(1)\times o_p(1)=o_p(1).
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore, we obtain that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^p}\mathbb{Z}_n(u)du=\int_{\mathbb{R}^p}\exp(u'\Delta_n-\frac{1}{2}u'\Gamma_nu)du+o_p(1)$. Moreover,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mathbb{R}^p}\exp\Big(u'\Delta_n-\frac{1}{2}u'\Gamma_nu\Big)du&=\exp\Big(\frac{1}{2}\|\Gamma_n^{-\frac{1}{2}}\Delta_n\|^2\Big)\int_{\mathbb{R}^p}\exp\Big(-\frac{1}{2}(u-\Gamma_n^{-1}\Delta_n)'\Gamma_n(u-\Gamma_n^{-1}\Delta_n)\Big)du\\
&=\exp\Big(\frac{1}{2}\|\Gamma_n^{-\frac{1}{2}}\Delta_n\|^2\Big)(2\pi)^{\frac{p}{2}}\det(\Gamma_n)^{-\frac{1}{2}},
\end{aligned}
$$

hence $\log\big(\int_\Theta\exp\{\mathbb{H}_n(\theta)\}\pi(\theta)d\theta\big)$ is given by

$$
\begin{aligned}
\log\left(\int_\Theta\exp\{\mathbb{H}_n(\theta)\}\pi(\theta)d\theta\right)&=\mathbb{H}_n(\theta_0)-\frac{p}{2}\log n+\log\Big\{\pi(\theta_0)\exp\Big(\frac{1}{2}\|\Gamma_n^{-\frac{1}{2}}\Delta_n\|\Big)(2\pi)^{\frac{p}{2}}\det(\Gamma_n)^{-\frac{1}{2}}+o_p(1)\Big\}\\
&=\mathbb{H}_n(\theta_0)-\frac{p}{2}\log n+\log\pi(\theta_0)\\
&\qquad+\frac{1}{2}\|\Gamma_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}\Delta_n\|^2+\frac{p}{2}\log 2\pi+\log\det(\Gamma_n)^{-\frac{1}{2}}+o_p(1).
\end{aligned}
$$

Finally we replace θ_0 by the QMLE $\hat{\theta}_n$:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Delta_n&=\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\partial_\theta\mathbb{H}_n(\theta_0)\\
&=\big(\sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta}_n-\theta_0)\big)'\Big(-\frac{1}{n}\partial_\theta^2\mathbb{H}_n(\check{\theta}_n)\Big),
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\check{\theta}_n=\hat{\theta}_n+\eta_1(\theta_0-\hat{\theta}_n)$ for some η_1 satisfying $0<\eta_1<1$. Because of Lemma 6.2, there exists a η_2 satisfying $0<\eta_2<1$ such that

$$
\begin{aligned}
-\frac{1}{n}\partial_\theta^2\mathbb{H}_n(\check{\theta}_n)&=\Gamma_n-\big(\sqrt{n}(\check{\theta}_n-\theta_0)\big)'\Big(\frac{1}{n\sqrt{n}}\partial_\theta^3\mathbb{H}_n\big(\theta_0+\eta_2(\check{\theta}_n-\theta_0)\big)\Big)\\
&=\Gamma_n-(1-\eta_1)\big(\sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta}_n-\theta_0)\big)'\Big(\frac{1}{n\sqrt{n}}\partial_\theta^3\mathbb{H}_n\big(\theta_0+\eta_2(\check{\theta}_n-\theta_0)\big)\Big)\\
&=\Gamma_0+o_p(1).
\end{aligned}
$$

Furthermore, we can show that $\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n}b(X_j'\hat{\theta}_n)X_jX_j'=\Gamma_n+o_p(1)=\Gamma_0+o_p(1)$ in the same way, so we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{H}_n(\theta_0)&=\mathbb{H}_n(\hat{\theta}_n)-\frac{1}{2}\big(\sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta}_n-\theta_0)\big)'\Gamma_0\big(\sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta}_n-\theta_0)\big)+o_p(1)\\
&=\mathbb{H}_n(\hat{\theta}_n)-\frac{1}{2}\big(\Gamma_0^{-1}\Delta_n\big)'\Gamma_0\big(\Gamma_0^{-1}\Delta_n\big)+o_p(1)\\
&=\mathbb{H}_n(\hat{\theta}_n)-\frac{1}{2}\|\Gamma_0^{-\frac{1}{2}}\Delta_n\|^2+o_p(1).
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus, the asymptotic behavior of the log marginal quasi-likelihood function is given by

$$
\begin{aligned}
\log\left(\int_\Theta\exp\{\mathbb{H}_n(\theta)\}\pi(\theta)d\theta\right)&=\mathbb{H}_n(\hat{\theta}_n)-\frac{p}{2}\log n+\log\pi(\hat{\theta}_n)\\
&\qquad+\frac{p}{2}\log 2\pi-\frac{1}{2}\log\det\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n}b(X_j'\hat{\theta}_n)X_jX_j'\right)+o_p(1).
\end{aligned}
$$

6.2. **Proof of Theorem 3.4.** Recall that $\theta_{m,0}$ and m_0 are given by $\{\theta_{m,0}\} = \operatorname{argmax}_{\theta\in\Theta} \mathbb{H}_{m,0}(\theta)$ and $\{m_0\} = \operatorname{argmin}_{m\in\mathcal{M}} \dim(\Theta_m)$, respectively, where $\mathcal{M} = \operatorname{argmax}_{m\in\{1,\dots,M\}} \mathbb{H}_{m,0}(\theta_{m,0})$. Fasen and Kimmig [16] proved the model selection consistency of likelihood-based information criteria, which include AIC and BIC, for multivariate continuous-time ARMA processes. We basically follow their scenario for the proof of Theorem 3.4.

(i) Θ_{m_0} is nested in Θ_m. Define the map $a : \Theta_{m_0} \to \Theta_m$ by $a(\theta) = A\theta + c$, where A and c satisfy that $\mathbb{H}_{m_0,n}(\theta) = \mathbb{H}_{m,n}\big(a(\theta)\big)$ for any $\theta \in \Theta_{m_0}$. Then the equation $\mathbb{H}_{m_0,0}(\theta) = \mathbb{H}_{m,0}\big(a(\theta)\big)$ is also satisfied for every $\theta \in \Theta_{m_0}$. If $a(\theta_{m_0,0}) \neq \theta_{m,0}$, $\mathbb{H}_{m_0,0}(\theta_{m_0,0}) = \mathbb{H}_{m,0}\big(a(\theta_{m_0,0})\big) < \mathbb{H}_{m,0}(\theta_{m,0})$ and assumption of the optimal model is not satisfied. Hence we have $a(\theta_{m_0,0}) = \theta_{m,0}$.

By the Taylor expansion of $\mathbb{H}_{m,n}$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{H}_{m_0,n}(\hat\theta_{m_0,n}) &= \mathbb{H}_{m,n}\big(a(\hat\theta_{m_0,n})\big)\\ &= \mathbb{H}_{m,n}(\hat\theta_{m,n}) - \frac{1}{2}\big\{\sqrt{n}\big(\hat\theta_{m,n} - a(\hat\theta_{m_0,n})\big)\big\}'\bigg(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\partial^2 b_m(X_j'\tilde\theta_n)X_jX_j'\bigg)\big\{\sqrt{n}\big(\hat\theta_{m,n} - a(\hat\theta_{m_0,n})\big)\big\},\end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde\theta_n = \hat\theta_{m,n} + \xi\big(a(\hat\theta_{m_0,n}) - \hat\theta_{m,n}\big)$ for some ξ satisfying $0 < \xi < 1$ and $\tilde\theta_n \xrightarrow{P} \theta_{m,0}$ as $n \to \infty$. Therefore, the difference between $\mathrm{QBIC}^{(m_0)}$ and $\mathrm{QBIC}^{(m)}$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{QBIC}^{(m_0)} - \mathrm{QBIC}^{(m)} &= \big\{\sqrt{n}\big(\hat\theta_{m,n} - a(\hat\theta_{m_0,n})\big)\big\}'\bigg(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\partial^2 b_m(X_j'\tilde\theta_n)X_jX_j'\bigg)\big\{\sqrt{n}\big(\hat\theta_{m,n} - a(\hat\theta_{m_0,n})\big)\big\}\\ &\quad + \log\det\big(-\partial_\theta^2\mathbb{H}_{m_0,n}(\hat\theta_{m_0,n})\big) - \log\det\big(-\partial_\theta^2\mathbb{H}_{m,n}(\hat\theta_{m,n})\big).\end{aligned}$$

We consider the behavior of the $\hat\theta_{m,n} - a(\hat\theta_{m_0,n})$. Because of the chain rule, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_\theta\mathbb{H}_{m_0,n}(\theta_{m_0,0}) &= A'\partial_\theta\mathbb{H}_{m,n}(\theta_{m,0}),\\ \partial_\theta^2\mathbb{H}_{m_0,n}(\theta) &= A'\partial_\theta^2\mathbb{H}_{m,n}\big(a(\theta)\big)A.\end{aligned}$$

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned}a(\hat\theta_{m_0,n}) - \theta_{m,0} &= A(\hat\theta_{m_0,n} - \theta_{m_0,0}),\\ \sqrt{n}(\hat\theta_{m_0,n} - \theta_{m_0,0}) &= \bigg(-\frac{1}{n}\partial_\theta^2\mathbb{H}_{m_0,n}(\check\theta_n)\bigg)^{-1}\bigg(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\partial_\theta\mathbb{H}_{m_0,n}(\theta_{m_0,0})\bigg)\\ &= \bigg\{A'\bigg(-\frac{1}{n}\partial_\theta^2\mathbb{H}_{m,n}\big(a(\check\theta_n)\big)\bigg)A\bigg\}^{-1}A'\bigg(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\partial_\theta\mathbb{H}_{m,n}(\theta_{m,0})\bigg)\\ &= \bigg\{A'\bigg(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\partial^2 b_m\big(a(\check\theta_n)\big)X_jX_j'\bigg)A\bigg\}^{-1}A'\bigg(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\partial_\theta\mathbb{H}_{m,n}(\theta_{m,0})\bigg)\\ &= \Big(A'\Gamma_{m,0}A\Big)^{-1}A'\bigg(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\partial_\theta\mathbb{H}_{m,n}(\theta_{m,0})\bigg) + o_p(1),\end{aligned}$$

where $\check\theta_n = \hat\theta_{m_0,n} + \eta\big(\theta_{m_0,0} - \hat\theta_{m_0,n}\big)$ for some η satisfying $0 < \eta < 1$ and $a(\check\theta_n) \xrightarrow{P} a(\theta_{m_0,0}) = \theta_{m,0}$ as $n \to \infty$. These equalities and Theorem 2.10 give

$$\begin{aligned}\sqrt{n}(\hat\theta_{m,n} - a(\hat\theta_{m_0,n})) &= \sqrt{n}(\hat\theta_{m,n} - \theta_{m,0}) - A\sqrt{n}(\hat\theta_{m_0,n} - \theta_{m_0,0})\\ &\xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} \Big\{\Gamma_{m,0}^{-1} - A\Big(A'\Gamma_{m,0}A\Big)^{-1}A'\Big\}N_{p_m}(0,\Sigma_0)\\ &= N_{p_m}\bigg(0, \Big\{\Gamma_{m,0}^{-1} - A\Big(A'\Gamma_{m,0}A\Big)^{-1}A'\Big\}\Sigma_0\Big\{\Gamma_{m,0}^{-1} - A\Big(A'\Gamma_{m,0}A\Big)^{-1}A'\Big\}\bigg) \sim \mathbf{N}.\end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}&P[\mathrm{QBIC}^{(m_0)} - \mathrm{QBIC}^{(m)} < 0]\\ &= P\bigg[\mathbf{N}'\bigg(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\partial^2 b_m(X_j'\tilde\theta_n)X_jX_j'\bigg)\mathbf{N} + \log\det\bigg(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\partial^2 b_{m_0}\big(X_j'\hat\theta_{m_0,n}\big)X_jX_j'\bigg)\\ &\qquad - \log\det\bigg(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\partial^2 b_m(X_j'\hat\theta_{m,n})X_jX_j'\bigg) < (p_m - p_{m_0})\log n\bigg]\end{aligned}$$

$$\to P\Big[\mathbf{N}'\Gamma_{m,0}\mathbf{N} + \log\det\big(\Gamma_{m_0,0}\big) - \log\det\big(\Gamma_{m,0}\big) < \infty\Big]$$

as $n \to \infty$. From Imhof [20, (1.1)], $\mathbf{N}'\Gamma_{m,0}\mathbf{N} = \sum_{j=1}^{p_m}\lambda_j\chi_j^2$ in distribution, where (χ_j^2) is a sequence of independent χ^2 random variables with one degree of freedom and λ_j are the eigenvalues of $\Gamma_{m,0}^{\frac{1}{2}}\big\{\Gamma_{m,0}^{-1} - A\big(A'\Gamma_{m,0}A\big)^{-1}A'\big\}\Sigma_0\big\{\Gamma_{m,0}^{-1} - A\big(A'\Gamma_{m,0}A\big)^{-1}A'\big\}\Gamma_{m,0}^{\frac{1}{2}}$. Furthermore, $\log\det\big(\Gamma_{m_0,0}\big) = O(1)$ and $\log\det\big(\Gamma_{m,0}\big) = O(1)$. Hence,

$$P\big[\mathbf{N}'\Gamma_{m,0}\mathbf{N} + \log\det\big(\Gamma_{m_0,0}\big) - \log\det\big(\Gamma_{m,0}\big) < \infty\big] \geq P\Big[\max_{j\in\{1,\ldots,p_m\}}\lambda_j\sum_{j=1}^{p_m}\chi_j^2 < \infty\Big] = 1.$$

(ii) $\mathbb{H}_{m,0}(\theta) \neq \mathbb{H}_{m_0,0}(\theta_{m_0,0})$ for every $\theta \in \Theta_m$. Because of Lemma 6.2 (i) and the consistency of $\hat{\theta}_{m_0,n}$ and $\hat{\theta}_{m,n}$, we have

$$\frac{1}{n}\mathbb{H}_{m_0,n}(\hat{\theta}_{m_0,n}) = \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{H}_{m_0,n}(\theta_{m_0,0}) + o_p(1) = \mathbb{H}_{m_0,0}(\theta_{m_0,0}) + o_p(1),$$
$$\frac{1}{n}\mathbb{H}_{m,n}(\hat{\theta}_{m,n}) = \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{H}_{m,n}(\theta_{m,0}) + o_p(1) = \mathbb{H}_{m,0}(\theta_{m,0}) + o_p(1).$$

Since $\mathbb{H}_{m_0,0}(\theta_{m_0,0})$ is lager than $\mathbb{H}_{m,0}(\theta_{m,0})$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&P[\mathrm{QBIC}^{(m_0)} - \mathrm{QBIC}^{(m)} < 0]\\
&= P\Big[-2\mathbb{H}_{m_0,n}(\hat{\theta}_{m_0,n}) + 2\mathbb{H}_{m,n}(\hat{\theta}_{m,n}) + \log\det\Big(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\partial^2 b_m\big(X_j'\hat{\theta}_{m_0,n}\big)X_jX_j'\Big)\\
&\qquad - \log\det\Big(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\partial^2 b_m(X_j'\hat{\theta}_{m,n})X_jX_j'\Big) < (p_m - p_{m_0})\log n\Big]\\
&= P\Big[\frac{-2}{n}\big(\mathbb{H}_{m_0,n}(\hat{\theta}_{m_0,n}) - \mathbb{H}_{m,n}(\hat{\theta}_{m,n})\big) + \frac{1}{n}\log\det\Big(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\partial^2 b_m\big(X_j'\hat{\theta}_{m_0,n}\big)X_jX_j'\Big)\\
&\qquad - \frac{1}{n}\log\det\Big(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\partial^2 b_m(X_j'\hat{\theta}_{m,n})X_jX_j'\Big) < (p_m - p_{m_0})\frac{\log n}{n}\Big]\\
&\to P\Big[-2\big(\mathbb{H}_{m_0,0}(\theta_{m_0,0}) - \mathbb{H}_{m,0}(\theta_{m,0})\big) < 0\Big] = 1
\end{aligned}$$

as $n \to \infty$.

Acknowledgements

The author wishes to thank the associate editor and two anonymous referees for careful reading and valuable comments which helped to greatly improve the paper. The author also thanks Professor H. Masuda for helpful comments and stimulating discussion.

References

[1] Akaike, H. (1973), Information theory and an extension of the maximum likelihood principle. In B. N. Petrov and F. Csàki (Eds.), *2nd Int. Symp. Information Theory*, pp. 267-281. Budapest: Academiai Kiado.
[2] Akaike, H. (1974), A new look at the statistical model identification. *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control.* **19**, 716-723.
[3] Antonio, K. and Beirlant, J. (2007). Actuarial statistics with generalized linear mixed models. *Insur. Math. Econ.*, **40**, 58–76.
[4] Baraud, Y., Comte, F. and Viennet, G. (2001). Adaptive estimation in autoregression or β-mixing regression via model selection. *Ann. Statist.*, **3**, 839–875.
[5] Berg, D. (2007), Bankruptcy prediction by generalized additive models. *Appl. Stochastic Models Bus. Ind.*, **23**, 129–143.
[6] Bozdogan, H. (1987), Model selection and Akaike's information criterion (AIC): The general theory and its analytical extensions. *Psychometrika*, **52**, 345–370.
[7] Burnham, K. P. and Anderson, D. R. (2002), *Model selection and multimodel inference: a practical information-theoretic approach*. Springer, New York.
[8] Casella, G., Girón, F. J., Martínez, M. L. and Moreno, E. (2009), Consistency of Bayesian procedures for variable selection. *Ann. Statist.* **37**, 1207–1228.
[9] Cavanaugh, J. E. and Neath, A. A. (1999), Generalizing the derivation of the Schwarz information criterion. *Comm. Statist. Theory Methods*, **28**, 49–66.
[10] Chen, J. and Chen, Z. (2008), Extended Bayesian information criteria for model selection with large model spaces. *Biometrika.* **95**, 759–771.
[11] Davydov, Y. A. (1973), Mixing conditions for Markov chains. *Theory of Probability & Its Applications*, **18**, 312–328.
[12] Domowitz, I. and White, H. (1982), Misspecified models with dependent observations. *J. Econometrics*, **20**, 35–58.

[13] Doukhan, P. (1994), *Mixing: Properties and Examples*. Springer, New York.
[14] Eguchi, S. and Masuda, H. (2015), Quasi-Bayesian comparison for LAQ models. MI Preprint series 2015–7.
[15] Fahrmeir, L. and Kaufmann, H. (1985), Consistency and asymptotic normality of the maximum likelihood estimator in generalized liner models. *Ann. Statist.*, **13**, 342–368.
[16] Fasen, V. and Kimmig, S. (2015). Information Criteria for Multivariate CARMA Processes. arXiv preprint arXiv:1505.00901.
[17] Haberman, S. and Renshaw, A. E. (1996), Generalized linear models and actuarial science. *The Statistician*, 407–436.
[18] Hastie, T. and Tibshirani, R. (1990), *Generalized Additive Models*, Chapman & Hall, London.
[19] Herrndorf, N. (1984), A functional central limit theorem for weakly dependent sequences of random variables. *Ann. Prob.*, 141–153.
[20] Imhof, J. P. (1961), Computing the distribution of quadratic forms in normal variables. *Biometrika*, 419–426.
[21] Konishi, S. and Kitagawa, G. (1996), Generalised information criteria in model selection. *Biometrika.* **83**, 875–890.
[22] Liebscher, E. (2005), Towards a unified approach for proving geometric ergodicity and mixing properties of nonlinear autoregressive processes. *Journal of Time Series Analysis*, **26**, 669–689.
[23] Lv, J. and Liu, J. S. (2014), Model selection principles in misspecified models. *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B. Stat. Methodol.*, **76**, 141–167.
[24] Masuda, H. (2013), Convergence of Gaussian quasi-likelihood random fields for ergodic Lévy driven SDE observed at high frequency. *Ann. Statist.*, **41**, 1593–1641.
[25] McCullagh, P. and Nelder, J. A. (1989), *Generalized Linear Models*, Chapman & Hall, London.
[26] McNeil, A. J. and Wendin, J. P. (2007), Bayesian inference for generalized linear mixed models of portfolio credit risk. *Journal of Empirical Finance*, **14**, 131–149.
[27] Schwarz, G. (1978), Estimating the dimension of a model. *Ann. Statist.*, **6**, 461–464.
[28] Sei, T. and Komaki, F. (2007), Bayesian prediction and model selection for locally asymptotically mixed normal models. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference* **137**, 2523–2534.
[29] Uchida, M. (2010), Contrast-based information criterion for ergodic diffusion processes from discrete observations. *Ann. Inst. Statist. Math.* **62**, 161–187.
[30] van der Vaart, A. W. (1998), *Asymptotic Statistics*. Cambridge University press.
[31] White, H. (1982), Maximum likelihood estimation of misspecified models. *Econometrica*, **50**, 1–25.
[32] Yoshida, N. (2011), Polynomial type large deviation inequalities and quasi-likelihood analysis for stochastic differential equations. *Ann. Inst. Statist. Math.*, **63**, 431–479.

7. Supplementary Material

7.1. **Proof of Lemma 6.1.** Lemma 6.1 follows from a direct application of Yoshida [32, Lemma 4].

7.2. **Proof of Lemma 6.2.** (i)

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{j\in\mathbb{N}} E[|\psi_j|^2] &= \sup_{j\in\mathbb{N}} E\big[\big|\big(Y_j - F(X_j)\big)X_j\big|^2\big] \\
&\le \sup_{j\in\mathbb{N}} E\big[\big|Y_j - F(X_j)\big|^2\big|X_j\big|^2\big] \\
&\lesssim \sup_{j\in\mathbb{N}} E\big[\big(|Y_j|^2 + \big|F(X_j)\big|^2\big)\big|X_j\big|^2\big] \\
&\le \sup_{j\in\mathbb{N}} E\big[\big(|Y_j|^2 + E[|Y_j|^2|\mathcal{F}_{j-1}\vee\sigma(X_j)]\big)\big|X_j\big|^2\big] \\
&\lesssim \sup_{j\in\mathbb{N}} E\big[(1+|X_j|^{C'})\big|X_j\big|^2\big] < \infty. \qquad (12)
\end{aligned}$$

Because of this inequality, we can apply Lemma 6.1 to obtain

$$\sup_{n>0} E\left[\left|\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{j=1}^n \psi_j\right|^2\right] \le \sup_{n>0}\frac{1}{n}E\left[\sup_{1\le i\le n}\left|\sum_{j=1}^i \psi_j\right|^2\right] < \infty.$$

Therefore, $\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{j=1}^n \psi_j = O_p(1)$, and Δ_n satisfies the equality

$$\Delta_n = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{j=1}^n \psi_j + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{j=1}^n \big(F(X_j) - \partial b(X_j'\theta_0)\big)X_j = O_p(1).$$

(ii) For some $C > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{\theta\in\Theta}\left|\frac{1}{n\sqrt{n}}\partial_\theta^3\mathbb{H}_n(\theta)\right| &\le \frac{1}{n\sqrt{n}}\sup_{\theta\in\Theta}\left(\sum_{i,k,\ell=1}^p \left|\partial_{\theta_i}\partial_{\theta_k}\partial_{\theta_\ell}\mathbb{H}_n(\theta)\right|^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\lesssim \frac{1}{n\sqrt{n}}\sup_{\theta\in\Theta}\sum_{i,k,\ell=1}^p \left|\sum_{j=1}^n \partial^3 b(X_j'\theta)X_{j,i}X_{j,k}X_{j,\ell}\right|
\end{aligned}$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{n\sqrt{n}} \sup_{\theta\in\Theta} \sum_{i,k,\ell=1}^{p} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \left|\partial^3 b(X_j'\theta)\right| \left|X_{j,i}X_{j,k}X_{j,\ell}\right|$$
$$\leq \sum_{i,k,\ell=1}^{p} \frac{1}{n\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sup_{\theta\in\Theta} \left|\partial^3 b(X_j'\theta)\right| \left|X_j\right|^3$$
$$\lesssim \sum_{i,k,\ell=1}^{p} \frac{1}{n\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \left(1+|X_j|^C\right)|X_j|^3$$
$$= \sum_{i,k,\ell=1}^{p} \frac{1}{n\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=1}^{n} O_p(1) = o_p(1).$$

7.3. **Proof of Lemma 6.3.** We have that

$$\int_{\mathbb{U}_n(\theta_0)\cap\{|u|\geq M_n\}} \mathbb{Z}_n(u)du = \int_{\mathbb{U}_n(\theta_0)\cap\{|u|\geq M_n\}} \exp\left\{u'\Delta_n + \frac{1}{2n}u'\partial_\theta^2 \mathbb{H}_n(\tilde{\theta}_n)u\right\}du$$
$$= \int_{\mathbb{U}_n(\theta_0)\cap\{|u|\geq M_n\}} \exp\left\{u'\Delta_n - \frac{1}{2}u'\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\partial^2 b(X_j'\tilde{\theta}_n)X_jX_j'\right)u\right\}du,$$

where $\tilde{\theta}_n = \theta_0 + \xi(\theta_0 + \frac{u}{\sqrt{n}} - \theta_0) = \theta_0 + \xi\frac{u}{\sqrt{n}}$ for some ξ satisfying $0<\xi<1$. From Assumption 2.5 (i), there exists a function $\underline{b}$ such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{U}_n(\theta_0)\cap\{|u|\geq M_n\}} \exp\left\{u'\Delta_n - \frac{1}{2}u'\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\partial^2 b(X_j'\tilde{\theta}_n)X_jX_j'\right)u\right\}du$$
$$\leq \int_{\mathbb{U}_n(\theta_0)\cap\{|u|\geq M_n\}} \exp\left\{u'\Delta_n - \frac{1}{2}u'\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\underline{b}(X_j)X_jX_j'\right)u\right\}du$$
$$\leq \int_{|u|\geq M_n} \exp\left\{u'\Delta_n - \frac{1}{2}u'\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\underline{b}(X_j)X_jX_j'\right)u\right\}du.$$

Fix any $\epsilon>0$. For $\lambda_0>0$ given in Assumption 2.5 (ii),

$$P\left[\int_{\mathbb{U}_n(\theta_0)\cap\{|u|\geq M_n\}} \mathbb{Z}_n(u)du > \epsilon\right]$$
$$\leq P\left[\int_{|u|\geq M_n} \exp\left\{u'\Delta_n - \frac{1}{2}u'\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\underline{b}(X_j)X_jX_j'\right)u\right\}du > \epsilon\right]$$
$$= P\left[\int_{|u|\geq M_n} \exp\left\{u'\Delta_n - \frac{1}{2}u'\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\underline{b}(X_j)X_jX_j'\right)u\right\}du > \epsilon; \lambda_{\min}\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\underline{b}(X_j)X_jX_j'\right) < \lambda_0\right]$$
$$+ P\left[\int_{|u|\geq M_n} \exp\left\{u'\Delta_n - \frac{1}{2}u'\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\underline{b}(X_j)X_jX_j'\right)u\right\}du > \epsilon; \lambda_{\min}\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\underline{b}(X_j)X_jX_j'\right) \geq \lambda_0\right]$$
$$\leq P\left[\lambda_{\min}\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\underline{b}(X_j)X_jX_j'\right) < \lambda_0\right] + P\left[\int_{|u|\geq M_n} \exp\left\{u'\Delta_n - \frac{1}{2}\lambda_0 u'u\right\}du > \epsilon\right]. \tag{13}$$

There exists a constant $K>0$ such that

$$P\left[\int_{|u|\geq M_n} \exp\left\{u'\Delta_n - \frac{1}{2}\lambda_0 u'u\right\}du > \epsilon\right]$$
$$= P\left[\int_{|u|\geq M_n} \exp\left\{u'\Delta_n - \frac{1}{2}\lambda_0 u'u\right\}du > \epsilon; |\Delta_n| > K\right]$$
$$+ P\left[\int_{|u|\geq M_n} \exp\left\{u'\Delta_n - \frac{1}{2}\lambda_0 u'u\right\}du > \epsilon; |\Delta_n| \leq K\right]$$
$$\leq P\left[|\Delta_n| > K\right] + P\left[\exp\left(\frac{\Delta_n'\Delta_n}{2\lambda_0}\right)\int_{|u|\geq M_n} \exp\left\{-\frac{\lambda_0}{2}(u-\lambda_0^{-1}\Delta_n)'(u-\lambda_0^{-1}\Delta_n)\right\}du > \epsilon; |\Delta_n| \leq K\right]$$
$$= P\left[|\Delta_n| > K\right] + P\left[\exp\left(\frac{\Delta_n'\Delta_n}{2\lambda_0}\right)\int_{|t+\lambda_0^{-1}\Delta_n|\geq M_n} \exp\left\{-\frac{\lambda_0}{2}t't\right\}dt > \epsilon; |\Delta_n| \leq K\right]$$

$$\leq P\Big[|\Delta_n| > K\Big] + P\Big[\exp\Big(\frac{K^2}{2\lambda_0}\Big)\int_{|t|\geq M_n-\lambda_0^{-1}K}\exp\Big\{-\frac{\lambda_0}{2}t't\Big\}dt > \epsilon\Big].$$

Because of Lemma 6.2 (i), for some N,

$$P\Big[|\Delta_n| > K\Big] + P\Big[\exp\Big(\frac{K^2}{2\lambda_0}\Big)\int_{|t|\geq M_n-\lambda_0^{-1}K}\exp\Big\{-\frac{\lambda_0}{2}t't\Big\}dt > \epsilon\Big] < \frac{\epsilon}{2} \tag{14}$$

for every $n \geq N$. Due to Assumption 2.5 (ii), (13) and (14),

$$P\Big[\int_{\mathbb{U}_n(\theta_0)\cap\{|u|\geq M_n\}}\mathbb{Z}_n(u)du > \epsilon\Big] < \epsilon$$

for all $n \geq N$. Thus, $\displaystyle\int_{\mathbb{U}_n(\theta_0)\cap\{|u|\geq M_n\}}\mathbb{Z}_n(u)du$ converges to 0 in probability.

7.4. **Proof of Theorem 2.8.** We consider *Argmax theorem* (van der Vaart [30, Theorem 5.56, Corollary 5.58]) for $\frac{1}{n}\mathbb{H}_n(\theta)$. Under Assumptions 2.1-2.5, $\hat{\theta}_n$ and θ_0 are given by $\{\hat{\theta}_n\} = \operatorname{argmax}_{\theta\in\Theta}\frac{1}{n}\mathbb{H}_n(\theta)$ and $\{\theta_0\} = \operatorname{argmax}_{\theta\in\Theta}\mathbb{H}_0(\theta)$, respectively. Hence, it is enough to show that $\frac{1}{n}\mathbb{H}_n$ converges to $\mathbb{H}_0$ uniformly in $\theta \in \Theta$. Since (7) and Lemma 6.1 are satisfied and Θ is a bounded convex domain, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{\theta\in\Theta}\Big|\frac{1}{n}\mathbb{H}_n(\theta) - \mathbb{H}_0(\theta)\Big| \\
&= \sup_{\theta\in\Theta}\Big|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n\psi_j'\theta + \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n\big\{\big(F(X_j)X_j'\theta - b(X_j'\theta)\big)\big\} - \int\big(F(x)x'\theta - b(x'\theta)\big)\nu(dx)\Big| \\
&\leq \Big|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n\psi_j\Big|\sup_{\theta\in\Theta}|\theta| + \sup_{\theta\in\Theta}\Big|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n\big\{\big(F(X_j)X_j'\theta - b(X_j'\theta)\big)\big\} - \int\big(F(x)x'\theta - b(x'\theta)\big)\nu(dx)\Big| \\
&\xrightarrow{P} 0.
\end{aligned}$$

7.5. **Proof of Theorem 2.10.** It will be shown in Section 6.1 that

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_0) = \Gamma_0^{-1}\Delta_n + o_p(1).$$

In view of Herrndorf [19, Theorem, Corollary 1], Δ_n converges to the normal distribution $N(0, \Sigma_0)$ in law if we show the following four conditions:

(i) $E\big[\big(Y_j - \partial b(X_j'\theta_0)\big)X_j\big] = 0$, $E\big[\big(Y_j - \partial b(X_j'\theta_0)\big)^2X_j'X_j\big] < \infty$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$.
(ii) $\frac{1}{n}E\Big[\Big\{\sum_{j=1}^n\big(Y_j - \partial b(X_j'\theta_0)\big)X_j\Big\}\Big\{\sum_{j=1}^n\big(Y_j - \partial b(X_j'\theta_0)\big)X_j\Big\}'\Big] \to \Sigma_0$ as $n \to \infty$.
(iii) $\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}}\alpha(k)^{\frac{1}{3}} < \infty$.
(iv) $\limsup_{n\to\infty}E\big[\big|\big(Y_n - \partial b(X_n'\theta_0)\big)X_n\big|^3\big] < \infty$.

Then, (ii) is ensured by Assumption 2.9 (ii).
(i) Because of Assumptions 2.2, 2.9 (i) and the definition of θ_0, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
E\big[\big(Y_j - \partial b(X_j'\theta_0)\big)X_j\big] &= E[\big(Y_j - F(X_j)\big)X_j + \big(F(X_j) - \partial b(X_j'\theta_0)\big)X_j] \\
&= 0 + \int\big(F(x) - \partial b(x'\theta_0)\big)x\nu(dx) \\
&= 0
\end{aligned}$$

for any $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Furthermore, from Assumption 2.1,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{j\in\mathbb{N}}E\big[\big(Y_j - \partial b(X_j'\theta_0)\big)^2X_j'X_j\big] &\lesssim \sup_{j\in\mathbb{N}}E\Big[\Big(|Y_j|^2 + |\partial b(X_j'\theta_0)|^2\Big)|X_j|^2\Big] \\
&\lesssim \sup_{j\in\mathbb{N}}E\Big[\Big((1 + |X_j|^{C'}) + (1 + |X_j|^C)^2\Big)|X_j|^2\Big] \\
&< \infty.
\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

(iii) Assumption 2.3 gives

$$\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}}\alpha(k)^{\frac{1}{3}} \leq c^{-\frac{1}{3}}\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}}e^{-\frac{1}{3}ck}$$

$$= c^{-\frac{1}{3}} \frac{e^{-\frac{1}{3}c}}{1 - e^{-\frac{1}{3}c}} < \infty.$$

(iv) In a similar way as (15), we can show that

$$\sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} E\Big[\big| \big(Y_j - \partial b(X_j' \theta_0) \big) X_j \big|^3 \Big] < \infty$$

Hence, (iv) is satisfied.

Graduate School of Mathematics, Kyushu University. 744 Motooka, Nishi-ku, Fukuoka 819-0395, Japan.
E-mail address: s-eguchi@math.kyushu-u.ac.jp